

ANGLO-SCOTTISH LITERARY RELATIONSHIPS, 1430-1550:
the Makars in Relation to the Non-Alliterative
English Tradition

Gregory Charles Kratzmann



Ph.D.
University of Edinburgh
1975

The research and writing for this thesis were undertaken entirely by me. To the best of my knowledge all sources have been fully acknowledged.

G.C. Kratzmann

Contents

Summary	i
Acknowledgements	iii
I. Introduction: two directions of influence; Chaucer and Lydgate in Scotland.	2
II. <u>The Kingis Quair</u> in relation to Chaucer and Lydgate.	45
III. The English affinities of <u>The Testament of Cresseid</u> .	91
IV. The <u>Morall Fabillis</u> and the English fable tradition.	134
V. <u>The Palice of Honour</u> as commentary on <u>The Hous of Fame</u> .	179
VI. Dunbar, Chaucer, and Lydgate.	218
VII. Skelton and Scottish poetry.	261
VIII. Two <u>Aeneid</u> translations: Surrey's debt to Douglas.	300
IX. <u>Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis</u> and Skelton's <u>Magnyfycence</u> .	333
X. Conclusion: the two traditions.	379
Appendices	
I. The Nightingale and the Cuckoo: Literary Reminiscence in <u>The Kingis Quair</u> .	428
II. Notes.	431
Select Bibliography.	466

Summary

This thesis is an investigation of the interrelations of late medieval and early renaissance Scottish and English poetry and drama. Two directions of influence are examined. The first is that of English literature upon Scottish. My main concern here is to illustrate, against the background of what is known of the taste for English poetry in Scotland, the various ways in which the Scots poets draw upon the work of Chaucer, and to a lesser extent that of Lydgate, in their own "making". In Chapters II-VI the English affinities of poems by James I, Henryson, Douglas, and Dunbar are examined. The term "Scottish Chaucerian" must be used carefully, because the individuality of these poets is reflected in the way each adapts Chaucer's work in order to complement his own distinctive "sentence". The extent to which Scottish poetry is guided by English precedents is very variable. There are differences from one poet to another, and within the work of individual writers: recognition of this must be made when considering Henryson and Dunbar. One of the most important aspects of the makars' "Chaucerianism" is the way in which they imply, through their own poetry, commentary upon Chaucer's work: this is a way of proclaiming not discipleship, but independence. In Chapter IX, another English influence upon Scots literature, that of Skelton's Magnyfycence upon Lindsay's Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, is discussed.

The second direction of influence, that of Scottish literature upon English, is discussed in Chapters VII and

VIII, with reference to poems by Skelton, Surrey, and Wyatt. There is good reason to believe that Colkelbie Sow is a source of the Skeltonic. Surrey's use of Douglas's Aeneid translation is also discussed, together with Wyatt's treatment of Henryson's The Two Mice. In Chapter III the influence of The Testament of Cresseid on sixteenth century English poetry is considered. Although fifteenth and early sixteenth century English and Scots poets are alike in paying tribute to Chaucer as the founder of the "Inglis" poetic tradition, the work of the makars is very different from that of their contemporaries in the south. In the concluding chapter an attempt is made to illustrate the divergence between two remarkably cohesive literary traditions, and to offer an explanation for its existence.

Acknowledgements

My greatest single debt is to my supervisor, Professor John MacQueen, who has given so generously of his time and of his great knowledge during the past three years. Although "hym liste not pinch nor gruche at every blot", Professor MacQueen's criticisms of my work have invariably been incisive and relevant. Without his guidance and understanding, the time I have spent at Edinburgh University would not have been nearly so enjoyable.

I am pleased to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. J. Stevenson, Co-Editor of The Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue, who has always been ready to help me with queries about the language of Scots poetry. I am equally grateful to Dr. W.S. Ramson of The Australian National University, first for guiding me in the direction of Edinburgh, and second for his comments on several chapters of this thesis. My thanks are due to Edinburgh University, for providing me with the studentship which made the undertaking of this project possible, and to The British Council for their help in the administration of my Commonwealth postgraduate award.

I owe a very considerable debt to my wife, Chasely Kratzmann, without whose understanding and assistance this thesis would never have been finished in time. Well aware of my stylistic and orthographical vagaries, she has typed a lengthy manuscript patiently and accurately. I must also acknowledge the assistance of Miss Janet Hadley, who has eased our burden of proof-reading.

Chapter I

Introduction: two directions of influence;
Chaucer and Lydgate in Scotland.

The aim of this thesis is to define and illustrate certain aspects of the relationship between English poetry and drama and Scottish poetry and drama of the period ca. 1430-1540. Two main directions of influence, of one national literature upon the other, are examined. The first is the influence of English poetry, the work of Chaucer and to a lesser extent of Lydgate, on the poetry of James I, Robert Henryson, Gavin Douglas, and William Dunbar. These are the makars to whom criticism has given the name "Scottish Chaucerians", and despite recent studies of the influence of Chaucer and his major English disciple on Scots poetry, the subject has not been discussed in sufficient detail. The major English influence on Scottish drama is that of Skelton's Magnyfycence on David Lindsay's comprehensive political morality, Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, which was written about a hundred years after The Kingis Quair. (These two works provide the chronological termini for the Scottish literature discussed.) Although it is not possible to trace developments in the early Scots dramatic tradition in the way that it is possible to trace developments within the poetic tradition, there is evidence to suggest that Skelton's play has the same kind of importance for Scottish drama as Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde has for Scottish poetry. The second direction of influence to be examined is that of Scots poetry upon English poetry of the early sixteenth century. Scots influences are apparent in the work of Skelton, Surrey, and Wyatt, and in a group of short poems which comprises one of the sources of Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida.

The variety of this material poses substantial problems of organization. Possibly, it might be argued that the two directions of influence might be discussed more adequately in separate studies. There are, however, good reasons for considering the two in a single thesis. There is an assumption, seldom stated but frequently implied, that Middle Scots poetry is so strongly localized - in terms of geography, language, and style - that it could not have influenced the way in which English poets wrote. J.M. Berdan, for example, assumes that political tensions between the two kingdoms brought about a state of cultural apartheid:

The two countries were separated by a sort of no-man's land. And as in addition English culture tended more and more to center at the court which was situated at London, Scotland was very far away. Moreover, the Scottish writers, Henryson, Dunbar, or Gawin Douglas, however individually brilliant, represent derivatives from Chaucer. As such they brought no new impulse into English, and in cases of similarity represent common inheritance rather than literary interchange.¹

There is a remarkable cohesiveness and continuity within the immensely various body of Scots poetry of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, but this does not prohibit the absorption of a degree of northern influence into English poetry after 1500. It would be wrong to suggest that this northern influence was as widespread or as stimulating as the earlier influence of English poetry upon Scots, but its existence must be taken into account. There have been studies of particular instances of the Scots influence, but to date no assessment of their collective significance. Political circumstances, far from being a deterrent to literary interchange, seem to have fostered it. Further

consideration of this matter will be made in the relevant chapters, but it may be noted here that at least three Scots poets - Dunbar, Douglas, and Lindsay - were in London in the early years of the sixteenth century. The fallacy of Berdan's "cultural isolation" argument becomes even clearer when we remember that poetry by Henryson, Douglas, and Lindsay had been published in London by the middle of the century. Consideration of the influence of Scots poetry upon English literature together with examination of the Chaucerian influence upon the work of the makars is valid as a way of qualifying the view that the latter is a strongly localized offshoot of the work of Chaucer and Lydgate.

There is another, related, reason for studying Anglo-Scottish poetry in terms of interrelationship. The poetry of fifteenth and early sixteenth century Scotland is such a varied and excellent body of literature that it may seem surprising that its influence on English writing was not greater. Since the high standard of so much Scots poetry is at least partially attributable to the desire of the makars to rival the achievements of English writers of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries by adapting features of their subject matter, language, and style, it seems appropriate to proceed to observe its effect on some of the English poetry of a later period, poetry which continued to pay homage to the triad of "masters" whose work was also appreciated by the Scots. No simple pattern of assimilation and reassimilation of Chaucer's influence is

proposed here. The Scots poetry which attracted Skelton and Surrey owes little to the example of earlier English poetry, and it is only by an accident of literary history that English writers came to know The Testament of Cresseid. The kind of Scottish poetry which helped to shape the Skeltonic style is far removed from any English influence, Chaucerian or otherwise. It is reasonable to assume that the few English poets who did adapt features of Scots poetry were moved by the same kind of impulse as that which moved James I and Henryson to write in a style which was recognizably Chaucerian, the impulse of the challenge offered by writing which shared the language but not the spirit of earlier and contemporary writing. If this conjecture may be conceded some force, it reinforces the claims outlined above for examining Scots-influenced English literature in a study which deals also with English-influenced Scots literature.

Five of the following chapters are concerned with the various ways in which Scots poets from James I to Dunbar drew upon the poetry of Chaucer, Lydgate, and a few lesser writers of the fifteenth century. This English influence must be seen in perspective: it is by no means the only foreign element in the background of Scots poetry, and the makars use Chaucerian poetry in a wide variety of ways.

As a foreign influence on Scots poetry, that of Chaucerian literature is rivalled in importance only by another English influence, that of alliterative poetry. As Sir

William Craigie explains, there is no evidence of any strong alliterative impulse at work in fourteenth and early fifteenth century Scots poetry (for example, in the Bruce and The Buik of Alexander), and it is therefore reasonable to infer that English alliterative poetry made its influence felt in Scotland long after it had ceased to be a significant force in England.² In Scottish poetry there is an impressive amount of alliterative rhymed stanzaic verse - The Buke of the Howlat, Golagros and Gawaine, The Taill of Rauf Coilzear, Henryson's Sum Practysis of Medecyne, Douglas's eighth Eneados Prologue, and several comic pieces.³ (C.S. Kelly, in her recent study of alliterative Arthurian poems, discusses the indebtedness of the late fourteenth century Awntyrs of Arthure, which is possibly a Scots work, to the alliterative Morte Arthure.)⁴ In the drama, the same kind of alliterative stanza is used several times in Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis. In The Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo, Dunbar uses alliteration systematically, although here the stanzaic form is discarded. Alliteration is used incidentally in many other poems for the sake of variety and emphasis. By the end of the fifteenth century, alliteration had been thoroughly naturalized into Scots verse, and it is hardly surprising that James VI and I, in Ane Schort Treatise Containing some Reulis and Cautelis to be obseruit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie, should set out guidelines for the use of "Rouncefallis or Tumbling verse".⁵ Incidental alliterative effects are to be found occasionally in English poetry of the same period, but there is no equivalent

to the Scots poets' thorough and imaginative exploitation of the technique. It is interesting to see how, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, Skelton attempts to reintroduce into English poetry what the Scots poets had taken over from the fourteenth century poets of northern England.⁶ A detailed consideration of the alliterative impulse within Scots poetry, just as important as the Chaucerian influence, is beyond the scope of this thesis.

As well as the two kinds of English influence, the Chaucerian and the alliterative, there is a variety of continental influences on Middle Scots poetry. Chaucer's poetry, which assimilates into English genres, themes, and stylistic devices drawn from French, Latin, and Italian sources, no doubt provided an important precedent for the makars: the Morall Fabillis and The Palice of Honour, for example, illustrate a talent for adaptation and synthesis which is reminiscent of the literary synthesis illustrated in The Parlement of Foules and Troilus and Criseyde. The French influence is, however, present in earlier Scots poetry which owes nothing to Chaucer, namely in Barbour's Bruce and The Buik of Alexander:⁷ the conventions of French romance are as important as "background" for Barbour's style as those of Chaucerian poetry are for the style of the later makars. In the fifteenth century, the influence of French romance continues to be important, in both alliterative (Golagros and Gawaine) and non-alliterative poetry (Lancelot of the Laik). In the genre of the fable, Henryson's Morall Fabillis and The Thre Prestis of Peblis reflect

different kinds of French influence. The Palice of Honour shows a knowledge of various French allegorical poems from the thirteenth century to Douglas's own lifetime, and a distinctively French style of allegory is the background to shorter works such as King Hart and The Garmont of Gud Ladeis. Not surprisingly, the influence of the Roman de la Rose is discernible in the work of James, Dunbar, Douglas, and others. There are traces of borrowing from various kinds of chanson throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: Clapperton's In Bowdoun on Blak Monunday, for example, is a near relative of the French chanson à mal mariée. In drama, the second part of Ane Satyre suggests that Lindsay was aware of the work of Pierre Gringore. These and other aspects of the French influence on Middle Scots literature are discussed by Janet M. Smith.⁸

The influence of Latin literature, both classical and medieval, is just as important for Scottish poetry as it is for the poetry of Chaucer and Lydgate. Latin was the literature of European learning, and it is inevitable that a wide variety of Latin works - poetry, prose treatises and commentaries of various kinds - should have been known and used by Scottish writers. Andrew of Wyntoun, at the beginning of his Oryginall Cronycle, explains that among the auctors available to him are Orosius (fifth century), Peter Comestor (twelfth century), and Martinus Polonus (thirteenth century).⁹ The Kingis Quair reveals a thorough knowledge of Boethius's De Consolatione, although it is possible that the influence of Boethian thought is indirect -

i.e., transmitted via Chaucer's translation and Troilus and Criseyde. In fable composition, one of The Tales of the Five Beasts is a loose translation of Nigel de Longchamps' Speculum Stultorum. (The major interest of this translation lies in its Chaucerian colouring.) The primary source of Henryson's Fabillis is a work from the same period, the twelfth century verse Romulus of Gualterus Anglicus, and there is evidence that Henryson drew on other Latin writings from Augustine and Aquinas to Boccaccio and Nicholas Trevet. The culmination of that familiarity with Latin literature which was fostered by grammar school and university curricula is Gavin Douglas's translation of Virgil into Scots. The claims advanced for the Scots Aeneid by C.S. Lewis (that it is finer than any modern translation)¹⁰ and by Ezra Pound (that parts of it are more appealing than the original)¹¹ testify to Douglas's scholarship, craftsmanship, and imagination.

Fifteenth and early sixteenth century Scottish poetry shows a smaller degree of influence from Italian literature. As Ronald D.S. Jack explains, the force of Italian writing is felt much more strongly after the middle of the sixteenth century. He suggests that Henryson's Orpheus and Eurydice may owe something to Poliziano's Orfeo, and that there may be a direct link between The Thre Prestis of Peblis and the Decameron.¹² The Palice of Honour recalls Petrarch's Trionfi in its numerous processions, although indebtedness is impossible to prove: the poem contains an elaborate account of "the Court Rhetoricall", in which a

number of prominent Italian humanists - Petrarch, Poggio Bracciolini, Fausto Andrelini, and Lorenzo Valla - are found in the company of Virgil, Ovid, Boethius, and Statius (898-915).

The literary influences at work on Middle Scots poetry are by no means entirely "foreign": the inspiration for many Scots poems comes from within the vernacular tradition - i.e., from other works written in Scots. For example, the great historical romance of the fourteenth century, Barbour's Bruce, may be regarded as the instigator of a distinctively Scots sub-genre which includes Hary's Wallace in the fifteenth century and Lindsay's Squyer Meldrum in the sixteenth. (Although the Wallace shows a knowledge of Chaucer's poetry, I have chosen not to discuss Hary's use of Troilus and Criseyde and The Canterbury Tales at length, because it is restricted to the borrowing of a relatively small number of words and phrases.) The number of fifteenth century tale or fable collections which incorporate some kind of narrative frame suggests that this, too, is a kind of poetry which was especially popular among Scots writers, and it is reasonable to infer that the interest in one collection of this kind led to the composition of others. A more clearly definable generic continuity is provided by the history of the flyting - Dunbar and Kennedy, Lindsay and James V, Montgomerie and Polwart, and "The flytting betuix the sowtar and the tailzor".¹³ In the last chapter, I intend to show why the continuity of the Middle Scots poetic tradition is more than a question of the popularity

of particular kinds of poem such as those mentioned above.

Although it is only one of several literary influences at work upon Scots poetry, that of Chaucer and Lydgate's verse is more influential than any other single body of non-Scots literature. Janet M. Smith concedes the priority of the English influence over the French: "it is seldom possible to point to direct borrowings [from French literature] unless the Scots poet is simply translating his original".¹⁴ This is also true, in general, of the use which Scots poets make of classical and Italian literature. What might be described as the "secondary" influence of Chaucerian poetry upon Scots - that is, as a guide to the assimilation of various kinds of non-vernacular writing - must always be kept in mind when source studies are made.

It is important that the ways in which various Scots poets use their knowledge of English poetry to creative advantage should be seen against the background of what is known about the taste for English poetry in Scotland in the period. The most obvious indication of this taste is the occurrence of English poems, "translait" into Scots, in a number of Scottish manuscripts and prints. The largest single source of such works, in which Scots words and forms are substituted for southern ones, is the manuscript which contains The Kingis Quair. MS. Seldon B. 24 is a Chaucerian miscellany: as well as Troilus and Criseyde, The Parlement of Foules, and The Legend of Good Women, it contains two poems which imitate Chaucer's style, Lydgate's

The Complaint of the Black Knight and Clanvowe's The Cuckoo and the Nightingale (The Boke of Cupide), as well as a fragment of Walton's Boethius translation and two short works by Hoccleve.¹⁵ "Translation" is probably too emphatic a way of describing the process by which English word forms and spellings are replaced by Scots ones, since all of these poems contain a large number of distinctively English features.¹⁶ A similar kind of scotticizing is illustrated by a slightly later version of The Complaint of the Black Knight (in the guise of "The Maying or Disport of Chaucer"), which was among the first products of the Chepman and Myllar press in 1508.¹⁷ Included in this print is a Scots version of Lydgate's Ryme without Accord, which is also in both the Bannatyne MS.¹⁸ and Maitland Folio MS.¹⁹ of the second half of the sixteenth century. Following this poem in the Bannatyne MS. is another Lydgatian moral piece, Ryght as a Rammes Horne.²⁰ Other English works which either Bannatyne or his "copeis awld, mankit and mvtillait" translate include the Canticus Troili from Book I of Troilus and Criseyde,²¹ extracts from The Complaint of the Black Knight²² and The Temple of Glas,²³ at least two Passion lyrics²⁴ and a dietary, attributed to Lydgate.²⁵ One of the Passion lyrics and the dietary are in the Makculloch MS., written in 1477 by a Scots student at Louvain.²⁶ Bannatyne attributes a number of short didactic and lyric pieces to Chaucer:²⁷ the extract from The Complaint of the Black Knight (No. CCCLXXI) and Hoccleve's The Letter of Cupid (No. CCCLXI) are among these, and one of the others, No. CCCLXII ("All tho that

list of wemen evill to speik") is among the short poems attributed to Chaucer in Thynne's 1532 edition of the Works.²⁸ The others are probably Scots versions of English works erroneously attributed to Chaucer in printed editions which have not survived. MS. Arundel 285, a pre-Reformation collection of devotional poems, contains a Scots version of the fifth part of Lydgate's Testament,²⁹ and there are other religious poems and "ballatis full of wisdom and moralitie" in Scots which are translations of southern works. There are, for example, fifteenth century English versions of the verse "God is a substance for evir durable", which Tod Ritchie mistakenly attributes to George Bannatyne,³⁰ and of the poem which begins, "I saw ane rob riche of hew".³¹ There are probably many more translations of this kind, contained in the Bannatyne and other manuscripts. (It is possible, too, that anonymous English verses may be translations from Scots: the long devotional poem The Contemplacioun of Synnaris, compiled by one "frer William of touris", was printed in an anglicized form by Wynkyn de Worde in 1499.)³²

In view of what appears to be a lack of interest by Scots poets in the longer historico-moral works of Lydgate, it is interesting to find a Scots version of two stanzas from The Fall of Princes in a sixteenth century collection of Gaelic poetry.³³ As well as the numerous and varied Scots versions of English poems, there were probably also impressive "presentation" copies of English work which have not survived. Evidence for this conjecture is provided by

contemporary writings: for example, it is known that Robert Maxwell, Bishop of Orkney, had "ane Inglis buke of Gowerè", and that David Paniter gave copies of both Chaucer and Gower to John Sinclair, Dean of Restalrig.³⁴ There is also evidence that at least one lavish Scots copy of poems by Chaucer existed in the sixteenth century. In 1652 the Provost of Queen's College, Oxford, wrote to the antiquary John Selden to enquire after "A Copy of Chaucer wch came out of Scotland": this may be the book referred to in the sale catalogue of the library of John Maitland, first Duke of Lauderdale, as "The Works of Sir Geoffrey Chaucer, curiously writ upon Vellum and gilded, very ancient".³⁵

The fact that Scots versions of a variety of fourteenth and fifteenth century English works - Chaucerian dream vision and romance, poems by Lydgate in the courtly mode as well as in the devotional and homiletic styles, anonymous moral verses - are so numerous testifies to the popularity of southern poetry in Scotland. It is reasonable to assume that not all English poems were available only in Scots translation: the dialects were sufficiently close that Scots readers would not have found southern words and forms unduly troublesome. The Paston letters record that Thomas Boyd, Earl of Arran, compelled to flee to London after the marriage of James III in 1469, borrowed from Anne Paston her "book .. of the Sege of Thebes".³⁶ (Sadly, the letters do not record Arran's reaction to Lydgate's work.) English printed works from Caxton's press undoubtedly found their way to Scotland. Henryson knew

both Caxton's Reynard and Aesop, and Douglas refers to Caxton's "Virgill in Eneados" at the beginning of his own translation, remarking with justifiable asperity that the two are "na mair lyke than the devill and Sanct Austyne" (Eneados I, Prol. 139-43).³⁷ English love lyrics were probably known in Scotland even before the early years of the sixteenth century: song-books are the kind of production which Scotland's two English queens, Joan Beaufort and Margaret Tudor, may be expected to have brought with them. "Allace depairting, grund of wo", a Scots lyric of the early sixteenth century, is modelled on two mid-fifteenth century English poems, as MacQueen shows.³⁸ It is highly probable that Alexander Scott, writing later in the century, had connections with the Wyatt circle in England: MacQueen discusses this with reference to "Lo, quhat it is to luve" and its companion piece.³⁹ Wyatt's "I am as I am and so will I be" is preserved (in Scots) in the Bannatyne MS. (No. CCCXXII).

The uses to which the makars put their knowledge of English poetry in their own writing form a more interesting subject for the literary critic than that of the existence of English poems in Scotland, whether in Scots or English linguistic form. The first thing which must be said of the influence of English poetry - the poetry of Chaucer and Lydgate - is that there is very little Scots verse of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries which is narrowly derivative. There is very little, that is, which can be dismissed fairly as second-hand poetry, echoing the subject

matter, forms, and techniques of English work without any enlivening spark of originality. The only poem of any length which does come near to fulfilling these prerequisites for oblivion is the late fifteenth century courtly complaint The Quare of Jelusy,⁴⁰ preserved in the same manuscript as The Kingis Quair. This poem, like the more spirited Lancelot of the Laik,⁴¹ is written in a self-consciously English style of which M.P. McDiarmid remarks, "It is .. only an appearance, a matter of spellings rather than sounds, the concealment of Scots usages by similar English ones, rather than the adoption, however irregular, as in the Quair, of values that produce rhymes only possible in Midland speech and forms that have no Scots equivalents".⁴² The author of the Quare evidently set himself the task of writing a poem which might pass as the work of Lydgate: in form, subject matter, and style it is substantially indebted to both The Complaint of the Black Knight and The Temple of Glas. There is imitation of poems by Chaucer and Lydgate in The Kingis Quair - occasionally it extends to direct quotation - but the crucial difference between the Quair and The Quare of Jelusy is that James's borrowings are subordinated to his own theme and structure.

It is fair to describe The Kingis Quair as a Chaucerian poem, providing that the label is not permitted to obscure James's originality in the handling of inherited material. The Chaucerianism of the Quair is partly a matter of its fairly extensive imitation of Chaucer's language and techniques, partly a matter of its qualities of

invention - like Chaucer, James is a master in the art of bringing "newe corn" from the "olde felde" of poetry. It is wholly appropriate that he should wish his book to be remembered in the company of Chaucer's work:

Vnto the impnis of my maisteris dere,
 Gowere and Chaucere, that on the steppis satt
 Of rethorike quhill thai were lyvand here,
 Superlatiue as poetis laureate,
 In moralitee and eloquence ornate,
 I recommend my buk in lynis sevin,
 And eke thair saulis vnto the blisse of hevin. (st.197)

Since James's style is much closer to Chaucer's than to Gower's, the association of the two English poets may seem surprising: it should be remembered that praise does not imply any wish to imitate. Gower was certainly known in Scotland (cf. Eneados IV, Prol. 214-15), but it is difficult to trace any specific influence from the Confessio Amantis. Henryson's The Testament of Cresseid, written at least half a century after the Quair, is also a Chaucerian poem. Like James, Henryson uses certain poetic techniques in a recognizably Chaucerian way: for example, both poets incorporate features of the first person method of Troilus and Criseyde into their own self-depictions, although in neither case is the similarity to Chaucer the product of simple imitation. There is no equivalent in the Testament to the passages in the Quair which contain sustained verbal echoes of Chaucer. Henryson's Chaucerianism is in large part the result of his decision to continue the story of Troilus and Criseyde as Chaucer tells it, introducing a moral and allegorical dimension which is his own invention. The standard of Henryson's writing is at least equal to that of Chaucer's, and for this reason alone it is not

difficult to understand why sixteenth century readers were able to accept the Testament as a sixth book of Troilus and Criseyde. Henryson's half-ironic reference to Chaucer in the account of the "uther quair",

Quha wait gif all that Chauceir wrait was trew?
Nor I wait nocht gif this narratioun
Be authoreist, or fenyeit of the new
Be sum Poeit, throw his Invention.. (64-7)⁴³

suggests that in writing the poem Henryson wished to invite direct comparison between his own work and Chaucer's.

MacQueen observes that "in the most Chaucerian of his works, Henryson is not the disciple, rather he regards himself with some justification as a fellow innovator with Chaucer".⁴⁴

The Kingis Quair and The Testament of Cresseid are, in terms of their style and subject matter, the two Middle Scots poems which are most directly related to English poetry. Despite the very considerable differences between the Scots poems and the English works to which they allude, it is clear that they could not have existed as they do but for their sources, of which Troilus and Criseyde is the most important. Elsewhere in Scots poetry the English influence appears in a more diffuse form, so that the term "Scottish Chaucerian" comes to have at best a limited relevance - to denote, for example, implied commentary on English poetry, and the use of similar techniques and forms, without the kinds of specific reference to poems by Chaucer (and Lydgate) which are to be found in the Quair and the Testament. Whereas the meaning of each of these

works is enriched if the audience recognizes the particular passages of English poetry to which reference is made, the meaning of the Morall Fabillis, The Palice of Honour, and The Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo is to a much greater extent "contained" within the immediate context of the poem. Each illustrates the adaptation of narrative details to enrich the development of story and theme: Henryson uses such different works as The Nun's Priest's Tale and Caxton's Reynard in this way. There are also adaptations of certain techniques in the work of Chaucer and Lydgate: Douglas and Dunbar, for example, both use a recognizably Chaucerian first person manner in The Palice of Honour and The Thrissil and the Rois, and both show a degree of indebtedness to Lydgate's use of language and imagery in Chaucerian pieces such as The Complaint of the Black Knight and The Temple of Glas. Again, form and content together may suggest the inspiration of an English poem: in this way two of Dunbar's poems are related to two of The Canterbury Tales, and The Palice of Honour to The Hous of Fame. (Douglas's poem may be read, as I intend to show, as a close and extended commentary on the earlier poem.) All of the kinds of influence mentioned here may be traced in The Kingis Quair and The Testament of Cresseid, but the latter proclaim their Chaucerian affinities much more openly. The literary relationships discussed in later chapters - the English borrowings from Scots poetry, and Lindsay's use of Skelton's play - do not illustrate this kind of specific verbal reference to their sources.

Since The Kingis Quair is nearer in time than any of the other Scots poems mentioned above to the work of Chaucer and Lydgate, and since its author spent his youth in England, it is hardly surprising that there should be such clear signs of the influence of English poetry. The Quair was almost certainly known to poets later in the century, but there is no evidence to suggest that James's account of his "aventure" stimulated any immediate flowering of Scots poetry along similar lines. Henryson's choice of subject matter and genres is an example of how little the makars were dependent upon English poetry: the Testament is directly related to Chaucer's work, but the Morall Fabillis and Orpheus and Eurydice draw upon a wide variety of sources, comparatively few of them English. The desire to see Henryson's Chaucerianism as extending beyond the Testament has produced inaccurate criticism of the Fabillis.⁴⁵ Reference has already been made to the implications of Henryson's "Quha wait gif all that Chauceir wrait was trew?" Allusions made by other makars to the English poets indicate a similar independence. Dunbar's praise of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate at the end of The Goldyn Targe is the most extensive such allusion, and although it is frequently quoted it is not always accurately interpreted:

O reverend Chaucere, rose of rethoris all,
 As in oure tong ane flour imperiall,
 That raise in Britane evir, quho redis rycht,
 Thou beris of makaris the tryumph riall;
 Thy fresch anamalit termes celicall.
 This mater coud illumynit have full brycht:
 Was thou noucht of oure Inglisch all the lycht,
 Surmounting eviry tong terrestriall,
 Alls fer as Mayis morow dois mydnycht?

O morall Gower, and Ludgate laureate,
 Your sugurit lippis and tongis aureate,
 Bene to oure eris cause of grete delyte;
 Your angel mouthis most mellifluate
 Oure rude langage has clere illumynate,
 And faire ourgilt oure speche, that imperfyte
 Stude, or your goldyn pennis schupe to wryte;
 This Ile before was bare and desolate
 Off rethorike or lusty fresch endyte. (253-70)⁴⁶

At the primary level of praise the passage has both meaning and sincerity: Chaucer and Gower, and later Lydgate, were unquestionably the founders of new styles of English poetry, bringing continental genres and styles into the vernacular, and enriching the vocabulary of poetry. Dunbar clearly intends that his own achievement should be seen as part of the tradition begun by Chaucer and Gower and continued by Lydgate, since he stresses the fact that he shares their medium of expression - "oure tong", "oure rude langage". There is not a trace of subservience in Dunbar's acknowledgement of his literary forbears. In its context, at the conclusion of what is probably one of the most elegantly contrived poems in either English or Scots, the praise of the English triumvirate serves to draw attention to Dunbar's own achievement as an "illuminator" of subject matter which carries a serious moral purpose. Dunbar excels in his use of the self-consciously heightened mode of rhetoric in which the tribute, and indeed the poem as a whole, is written, and he implicitly invites his audience to compare his craftsmanship and enrichment of language with the achievements of past masters. One of the most remarkable features of Dunbar's style is the apparent ease with which an elaborate imported vocabulary is combined with familiar words drawn from Scots: this is evident,

for example, in the account of the ship's departure, where words such as "frak", "reke", "rak", "sprent", and "crak" are used to good onomatopoeic effect (235-43). The fact that Dunbar draws a distinction, through the division of stanzas, between Chaucer and the other two has a double significance, first in implying recognition of Chaucer's supremacy, second in suggesting that Dunbar's own poetry aspires to the same high level of excellence.

Dunbar's use of the praise topos is of course traditional, in the sense that Chaucer's poetry is acknowledged and lauded by Hoccleve and Lydgate.⁴⁷ English poets after Lydgate - Ashby, Metham, Bokenham, Feylde, Hawes, and others - all present their claims to be considered as the unworthy successors to Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate.⁴⁸ Comparison between some of these passages and the lines in The Goldyn Targe suggests that Dunbar uses the praise convention as a way of claiming his superiority in the craft of words. The imagery and language of the passage suggest that it was modelled on one of Lydgate's many tributes to his master. In the Prologue to The Siege of Thebes, for example, Chaucer is styled "Floure of Poetes", and attention is drawn to his "sugrid mouth" and power to "enlumyne" (cf. GT, 254, 263).⁴⁹ The following lines from The Life of Our Lady are even closer to Dunbar: Chaucer is addressed as "The noble rethor Poete of bretaine",

That made firste to distille and reyne
The gold dewe droppis of speche and eloquence
Into oure tounge thour3 his excellence
And founde the flourys first of rethoryk
Oure rude speche oonly to enlumyne.⁵⁰

Dunbar "outdoes" Lydgate, enhancing the English poet's words and images by the use of incidental alliteration and a more sinuous line. He is not alone among Scots poets as a continuator of this kind of Lydgatian ornate style - his experiments with it are rivalled by those of Gavin Douglas.

Douglas's praise of Chaucer, like Dunbar's, is calculated to invite favourable comparison between Chaucer's work and his own. In the first Eneados Prologue, there is an address to,

venerabill Chauser, principal poet but peir,
Hevynly trumpat, orlege and reguler,
In eloquens balmy, cundyt and dyall,
Mylky fontane, cleir strand and royss ryall,
Of fresch endyte, throu Albion iland braid.. (339-43)

Recognition of Chaucer's superiority to Gower and Lydgate is also implicit in the place he is given among the British contingent at the "Court Rethoricall" in The Palice of Honour:⁵¹

3it saw I thair of Brutus' Albyon
Geffray Chauceir, as A per se sans peir
In his vulgare, and morall Iohne Goweir.
Lydgait, the Monk, raid musing him allone. (918-21)

Although Douglas readily admits that Chaucer is a greater poet than he,

For as he standis beneth Virgill in gre,
Vndir hym alsfer I grant my self to be, (I, Prol.
407-8)

he is ready to take Chaucer to task for his claim, in The Legend of Dido, to be following Virgil faithfully. From Douglas's more scholarly viewpoint as an accurate translator, Chaucer has indeed "gretly Virgill offendit" by taking liberties with the characterization of Aeneas.

There is no parallel in contemporary English writing to Douglas's stringent rebuke of Chaucer, an example of the sense of independent judgement current among Scots poets. It is difficult to take Douglas's claim "For me lyst with nane Inglis bukis flyte" (272) seriously, since he criticizes both Chaucer and the hapless Caxton at such length.

The series of tributes to English poetry by Scots poets reflects a combination of genuine admiration and unmistakable confidence in their own creative powers. The latter is strengthened by the bonds between Scots poets. Testimony to this feeling of creative sympathy is given by Douglas's borrowing from Dunbar's tribute to the English poets: in the Eneados Douglas follows Dunbar's association of Chaucer with regality and the rose, giving his own distinctive amplification of Dunbar's imagery of the sun in the line "Hevyonly trumpat, orlege and reguler". Some twenty years later, Lindsay adapts Douglas's image of the bell of rhetoric, used to praise Virgil (I, Prol. 10), for his own testimony to English poetry in The Testament of the Papyngo:⁵²

For quhy the bell of Rethorick bene roun
Be Chawceir, Goweir, and Lidgate laureate.
Quho dar presume thir Poetis tyll Impung,
Quhose sweit sentence throuch Albione bene song?
(11-14)

It is very appropriate that Lindsay should go on to adapt Douglas's tribute to Chaucer in the Eneados as a way of praising Douglas's own achievement:

Allace for one, quhilk lampe wes of this land,
Off Eloquence the flowand balmy strand,
And, in our Inglis rethorick, the rose,

As of Rubeis the Charbunckle bene chose:
 And, as Phebus dois Synthia presell,
 So Gawane Dowglas, Byschope of Dunkell,

Had, quhen he wes in to this land on lyue,
 Abufe vulgare Poetis prerogatyue,
 Boith in pratick and speculatioun. (22-30)

Lindsay regards himself as a continuator of the Chaucerian tradition, but it is clear from his own "pratick and speculatioun" that his closest affinity is with the poetry of Douglas.

Throughout this chapter emphasis has been placed on the prominence of Chaucer's influence upon the makars. It is more important than that of any other non-alliterative English writer, Lydgate included. The priority which the makars give to Chaucer in their tributes reflects the trend of their borrowings from English poetry. This discrimination is given insufficient attention by Denton Fox, who contends that the Scots poets did not know very much about the canons of the three poets "so that they did not make clear or accurate distinctions between them", and that they had a strictly utilitarian interest in the literary past:

They did not wish to make comparative evaluations, but to use the new modes of poetry which Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate had introduced, and to steal from them anything that seemed useful: diction, rhetoric, genres. Lydgate, voluminous, dilute, and easy to improve upon, was in many ways more immediately useful to his successors than Chaucer who, like other poets of the very first rank, did not always have a beneficent influence on his followers.⁵³

It is of course quite likely that they were unaware that a poem such as The Complaint of the Black Knight was not by Chaucer, but there is very little evidence of the kind of

indiscriminate borrowing from English poetry which Professor Fox describes. There are, notably in the work of James I and Dunbar, some instances of "improvement" upon Lydgate - Dunbar's tribute at the end of The Goldyn Targe is a good example - but there is good reason to believe that these poets and others found Chaucer's poetry more valuable and more stimulating than Lydgate's. It is suggestive that neither James I nor Henryson allude to Lydgate at all. Henryson's failure to do this is perhaps not surprising, since the framework of the Fabillis does not permit any direct reference to an auctor other than Aesop, but the omission of Lydgate's name at the end of the Quair is puzzling, since at several points in the poem James "re-works" passages from at least two of Lydgate's works. The failure to mention Lydgate as a master of the art of cloaking "moralitee" in "eloquence ornate" may be, as John Norton-Smith suggests,⁵⁴ due to the fact that Lydgate was still alive when the poem was written, but there is an equal possibility that the omission reflects a critical judgement that Lydgate does not share the "superlatiue" status of his predecessors.

No adequate assessment of the relative importance of Chaucer and Lydgate to Scots poets can be made without detailed discussion of particular poems, but the implications of the tributes are to a large extent supported by numerical comparison between the works of Chaucer and of Lydgate which are used, and by comparison between the kinds of influence which they exert. Nearly all of Chaucer's

major poems, from the dream visions to The Canterbury Tales and Troilus and Criseyde, were used in various ways by Scots poets. Troilus and Criseyde is of paramount importance, since both James I and Henryson draw upon it extensively to enrich their own statements about the nature and value of human love. Both The Knight's Tale and The Parliament of Foules are sources of dramatic and descriptive passages in The Kingis Quair. The Palice of Honour makes systematic reference to The Hous of Fame, and like the author of Lancelot of the Laik, Douglas borrows images and narrative details from the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women. Henryson's fable of the Cock and the Fox probably reflects a knowledge of The Nun's Priest's Tale, and the unknown author of The Tales of the Five Beasts imitates Chaucer's "voice" in The General Prologue very successfully. There are several echoes of Chaucer's dream visions in the poetry of Dunbar, and The Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo and Sir Thomas Norny invite comparison with The Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale and Sir Thopas. Although Lydgate's poetic output is quantitatively much larger than Chaucer's, comparatively few of his works appear to have inspired Scots poets. In fact, two of his most Chaucerian pieces, The Temple of Glas and The Complaint of the Black Knight are the only ones which elicit any sustained imaginative response. James I appears to use The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man in the way that Dunbar uses Reson and Sensuallyte, as the source of a few narrative details. It is possible that Dunbar's choice of certain genres owes something to Lydgate's example. Henryson

probably knew The Assembly of Gods (which if not written by Lydgate is the work of a devoted disciple) and the Isopes Fabules, although there is no significant indebtedness to either work. Lydgate's influence may of course be discerned in ways other than borrowings from individual poems, notably in the use of aureate diction and in his contribution to the Chaucerian style of nature description. Although Lydgate was undoubtedly known to fifteenth and early sixteenth century Scots poets and respected by them, there is very little evidence that the English poet's longer and more ambitious historico-religious pieces - The Troy Book, The Fall of Princes, The Siege of Thebes - had any significant effect on their choice of subject matter, form, or style. It is not possible to say that this kind of lengthy and uniformly serious literature was not to Scottish taste, but it does seem likely that northern readers were content to look no further than the French-influenced "histories" produced by Scots poets.

Lydgate looms much larger as an influence on the style and subject matter of fifteenth and sixteenth century poetry in England, and as I shall attempt to show in the final chapter, this is one of the major reasons for the great differences between contemporary English and Scots poetry. The question of why Chaucer's poetry was so much more important than Lydgate's for the development of the Scots tradition cannot be answered decisively, but neither can it be ignored. It is not sufficient to observe that a succession of talented poets in Scotland responded to

Chaucer's poetry simply because it was so much richer and more diverse than any previous or subsequent non-alliterative poetry. The degree of interest in Chaucer is partly due to the fact that the Scots poets were trying to achieve in their form of "Inglis" what Chaucer had been the first to achieve in "sudron": an assimilation of continental poetic forms and techniques into new poetry which would dignify the vernacular. In English, Chaucer is the supreme "Grant translateur", and it is almost inevitable that poets in Scotland who wished to communicate with a cultivated native audience in their own language should have been impressed by Chaucer's example. Like Chaucer, a succession of poets after James I are engaged upon what H.A. Mason (in a different context) calls "a critical-creative activity, a process of assimilation in which the native digestion system is as important as the foreign matter assimilated".⁵⁵ Scottish literature does not, of course, begin with The Kingis Quair, but this poem is the first to be written in the Chaucerian style of courtly allegory which descends from the Roman de la Rose. For the poets writing later in the fifteenth century, Chaucer's poetry is an example rather than a model: that is to say, they are concerned less with imitation than with naturalizing forms of poetry similar to those which Chaucer had earlier introduced into English. Denton Fox describes the process thus, with specific reference to Dunbar:

Dunbar's .. debt to Chaucer is no more than a matter of genres. The situation here is very similar: Chaucer did not so much invent new genres as naturalise Continental ones, or embellish and refine pre-existent native genres. A large number of Dunbar's

poems are written in Chaucerian genres: allegorical poems about spring and love, dream-visions, moral lyrics, and witty begging poems.⁵⁶

The influence of Chaucer's achievement upon Dunbar's choice of subject matter and form - and upon that of other Scots poets - is undoubtedly important, but it is necessary to bear in mind that the makars were able to absorb other foreign influences as well: probably more, in fact, than had been accessible to Chaucer in the second half of the fourteenth century. It is not surprising that Scots poetry is not closer than it is to Chaucer's work, when we remember the distance between fifteenth century Scotland and fourteenth century England, a distance which is temporal, geographical, cultural, and linguistic.

The linguistic distance is perhaps the most important. Although the language of late fifteenth and early sixteenth century Scots poetry incorporates southern forms and inflections, it is a written form of northern dialect, with its own distinctive linguistic and grammatical features.⁵⁷ Middle Scots vocabulary is richer and more varied in its range than the language of either Chaucer or his English successors. As well as the Romance component, there is a strong Scandinavian element (stronger than in English) and a smaller proportion of words taken from Gaelic. There were continual additions to the language from sources other than English writing. At the beginning of his Aeneid translation, Douglas pays tribute to the stability of his own spoken language:

And zit forsuyth I set my bissey pane
 As that I couth to mak it braid and plane,
 Kepand na sudron bot our awyn langage,
 And spekis as I lernyt quhen I was page. (I, Prol.
 109-12)

He goes on to explain that although his language contains many borrowings from French, Latin, and English already, he has felt obliged, in the interests of "fowth" and clarity, to make more (113-20). Douglas and his fellow makars also use words which are taken over from alliterative poetry, a fertile source of synonyms and vividly descriptive words from which southern English poets largely dissociated themselves. At a time when the range of words available to southern poets (especially in the lower registers) appears to have been contracting as a result of pressures towards standardization, the Scots poets were consolidating and adding to an already stable and varied language.

Recognition of Chaucer's priority and superiority to Lydgate as a "translateur" of continental forms into English goes some way towards explaining why poets using a different but related literary language should have paid more attention to his work. A second reason for this is also probable, namely that the makars recognized that the milieu in which Chaucer composed his work was in some respects much closer to their own than to that of Lydgate. Two related factors must be considered here. The first is that Chaucer was a court poet, writing from the cultural hub of his country: H.S. Bennett provides a brief but illuminating review of the variety of social and cultural

forces with which Chaucer must have been in contact at the courts of Edward III and Richard II.⁵⁸ The second is the nature of the relationship between the poet and his public, and the effect which this may be assumed to have had on Chaucer's style. Undoubtedly Chaucer expected his poetry to be read privately by "silent" readers like himself,⁵⁹ but his writing must also have been conditioned by the demands of reading aloud. Court poetry is a form of communal recreation, in which entertainment is to be combined with edification. This is illustrated by the scene which Pandarus interrupts in Troilus and Criseyde:

and he in forth gan pace,
And fond two othere ladys sete, and she,
Withinne a paved parlour, and they thre
Herden a mayden reden hem the geste
Of the siege of Thebes, while hem leste. (II, 80-84)⁶⁰

The illumination in the Corpus Christi Troilus manuscript, showing the figure of the poet reading aloud to an audience of courtiers,⁶¹ is perhaps a symbolic representation of the social composition of Chaucer's audience, but it is just as likely that it presents an accurate picture of the way in which poetry was usually read and enjoyed. The central organizing principle of The Canterbury Tales makes great poets out of figures drawn from all levels of society, but the fiction of an oral tale-telling competition is a reminder that most forms of medieval literature, from romance to sermon, originated in a performing relationship between a speaker and an audience. The poetry itself provides the strongest testimony to its manner of presentation: again and again Chaucer addresses an audience which is physically present - "But wherefore that I speke

al this?", "I wol yow seyn", "This trowe I, knoweth al this compaignye"... So prevalent is the tendency that it is impossible to believe that oral conventions are being used anachronistically. The intimacy of tone thus created is fostered by Chaucer's distinctive use of the first person method, his fondness for introducing his own reactions to his "matere", in tones which range from cheerful naïveté and puzzlement to unequivocal "high seriousness". John Lawlor provides an excellent account of the demands of performance:

A poet who reads to a select audience can supply tone, look, and gesture at need; and these will serve as the readiest means to varying the perspectives of the telling, so that now he can come very close to his audience, addressing them directly, now mark his departure from them by growing absorption in his story or by stubborn clinging to a conviction (often with cheerful naïveté, as befits the actual status of the poet) which the course of his story may show to be ill-founded. This allows a subtle and highly variable range of effect, mixing grave and gay with a rapidity that may strike us as bewildering. It makes for a flexibility that knits together discontinuous and sometimes apparently discordant elements; and it can confer an entire simplicity to sustain the story at moments of crisis.⁶²

Lydgate is an inferior poet to Chaucer: no amount of historical argument can explain away a deficiency of invention and craft. Yet the fact that he wrote within a milieu which was fundamentally different from Chaucer's explains to some extent the difference in the texture of most of his verse. Unlike Chaucer, Lydgate was not a court poet, writing with the advantage of his predecessor's centrality in the world of literature and human affairs. A series of dedications to notable personages such as Humphrey of

Gloucester, Henry VI, and the Earl of Warwick should not prevent recognition that Lydgate's vocation lay elsewhere. The abbey of Bury St. Edmunds did not isolate its inhabitants from the realities of the larger world - it would be wrong to entertain a sentimental view of Lydgate as successor to Chaucer's ideal monk, "Upon a book in cloystre alwey to poure" - but at the same time it is clear that monastic status separated Lydgate from what cultural court life there was. W.F. Schirmer observes:

Chaucer's select audience, with its taste sharpened on French literature, and its delight in allusions, wit, and irony had ceased to exist. The court of the sober-minded Henry IV no longer had the same brilliance as under the romantic Richard II, during whose unhappy reign many of the finest works of Middle English literature were composed. With the fading of semi-French culture the lay poet gave way to the cleric.⁶³

Lydgate has the prestige of the poet who writes to be "published" to an audience considerably wider, and as literacy progressed more socially diverse, than Chaucer's courtly audience. Well-to-do readers, some of them aristocrats, some rural gentry, some burgesses, could obtain their copies of his latest work from commercial scriptoria like that of John Shirley. Derek Pearsall suggests that literature was a status symbol for this new audience, that they "preferred a big book to a good one".⁶⁴ It may well be that the phenomenon of a new reading public contributed to a decline in the standards of poetry, but it is more certain that the changed circumstances of presentation contributed to the stylistic difference between Chaucer's poetry and Lydgate's. The diffuseness of syntax, the extended amplifications, the monotonous rhythms, and the

absence of significant variations of tone and language in Lydgate's longer works are all parts of a composite deficiency - the lack of any sense of the poet's presence in his work. This rather harsh judgement cannot be applied to all of Lydgate's verse. Some of the shorter religious and didactic pieces are pleasing examples of their kind, and the works in the Chaucerian mould (The Complaint of the Black Knight, The Temple of Glas), although lacking Chaucer's feeling for dramatic situation, have a certain formal elegance. It is interesting to observe that a sixteenth century Scots reader of the Chepman and Myllar print of the Complaint describes it as "liber probus atque amabilis atque pro auriculus audiendus". (Although faint, the last word is definitely not "arduus", as has been claimed.)⁶⁵ What is absent from most of Lydgate's enormous poetic output are the changes of tone and language, the shifts of irony and the broader humour which contribute so much to the life of Chaucer's poetry. The difference between the two becomes strikingly clear when the first eighteen lines of The General Prologue - one massive unfolding sentence carefully moulded into a pattern of clauses, unified by the voice of the poet - are compared with the imitation of them at the beginning of The Siege of Thebes. Lydgate's Prologue is a muddle of clauses, one apparently giving birth to the next, and there is no main clause at all. One suspects that Lydgate would have been a better and a less prolix poet if he had been compelled to observe the discipline of oral presentation.

It is Scots poetry of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries to which we must turn to find the equivalent of the sense of authorial presence which makes Chaucer's poetry so different from Lydgate's. In a great deal of Scots writing, as in Chaucer's work, authorial presence is apprehended in two ways, through the movement of the verse, and through what the "I" of the poet tells of himself and his reactions to his subject matter. The first is largely a matter of rhythm, and it consists in establishing a balance between speech rhythms and the demands of a metrical pattern. Chaucer is a flexible metrist, and in his work allowance is always made for variations from a basic pattern. Derek Pearsall makes the perceptive comment that the movement of Lydgate's verse is so different because he "seized on [Chaucer's] casual variants and used them systematically, often regardless of rhetorical or rhythmical context".⁶⁶ The metrical flexibility of Chaucer's verse is accompanied by variations of tone and language: an especially memorable example is the conclusion of Troilus and Criseyde, where the insistent and declamatory high style of the "Swich fyn" stanza gives way to a gentler, more subdued form of address,

And thus bigan his lovyng of Criseyde
As I have told, and in this wise he deyde.

As a narrator, Chaucer continually stresses his involvement in the narrative, either as an interpreter of his "matere" or as a participant in its action. In the dream visions and in Troilus and Criseyde, the carefully balanced tension between commitment to his subject matter and the desire to

distance himself from it, to stress his "unlikliness", gives a strongly personal and dramatic edge to the narrative. The distinctive blend of involvement and withdrawal is accompanied by those frequent appeals to the understanding and experience of his audience which provide the clearest indication that Chaucer's poetry was written for an audience of listeners.

A recurrent theme in this study is the combination of spoken effects with memorable authorial self-characterizations in Scots poetry. It would, of course, be inaccurate to suggest that these features are developments from Chaucer's poetry alone. All good verse which is composed with oral delivery in mind illustrates the subordination of metrical pattern to the capabilities of speech. Barbour's practice in the Bruce, for example, well fulfils his introductory promise that stories "said on gud maner,/ Have doubill plesance in heryng".⁶⁷ The association of spoken effects with strong authorial self-characterizations is also to be found in English alliterative works such as Pearl and Piers Plowman, in the Roman de la Rose, in La Divina Commedia and the Trionfi, and the practice of Scots poets was no doubt strengthened by their knowledge of this non-Chaucerian poetry. Local tradition is important, too: the sense of a personal communication between poet and audience in the work of Dunbar and Douglas, for example, owes something to the practice of earlier Scots poets. These qualifications do not, however, weaken the argument that Chaucer's poetry was attractive to the Scots because

its personal, spoken, quality had its social origins in a milieu similar to their own. It is totally logical that the Scots poets, unlike their counterparts in England, should have preferred the "spoken" Chaucer to the "written" Lydgate.

Not all Scots poetry of this period was written with a "gentill" audience in mind, but a remarkable amount of it proclaims its connection with the court. James I, whose literary tastes are praised by Bower⁶⁸ and Mair,⁶⁹ is the court poet par excellence: The Kingis Quair suggests the kind of community of feeling between poet and audience which underlies Troilus and Criseyde. Dunbar combined the functions of cleric with those of court poet in the household of James IV, and we do not need the Treasurer's Accounts to tell us how closely Dunbar's life was connected to the life of the court. Douglas was himself "of noble strynd", and his dedication of The Palice of Honour to the King suggests the kind of audience for which he wrote the poem. Lindsay's poetry, written in and after the reign of James V, shows a keen familiarity with the affairs of court and state. There is no internal evidence to suggest that Henryson was a "courtman", but there is reason to believe that both Orpheus and Eurydice and The Testament of Cress-eid were written with a court audience in mind: the former begins with a reflection on "nobilnes and grit magnificens" which has little point in a non-courtly context, and the latter culminates in a thinly-veiled warning to the ladies of the court. There is reasonable evidence of Henryson's

association with Dunfermline, whose abbey had a royal guest-house, and it would have been quite natural for the poet's abilities to be brought to the attention of James III: Pitscottie chronicles the king's love of learning and the arts.⁷⁰ The existence in Scotland of a court environment in which the arts were valued was a safeguard to the life of poetry, and it is apparent that the tradition of poetry in performance survived until well into the sixteenth century. There is no Scots equivalent to the Corpus Christi illumination, but the poetry provides its own evidence. For example, James tells his "litill tretisse" that the "tong" of the reader (one other than the poet himself) will remedy its defects (KQ, st. 194). At the beginning of Book III of The Palice of Honour, Douglas implores the Muses,

Sum gratiois sweitnes in my breist Imprent
Till mak the heirars bowsum and attent
Reidand my writ.. (1293-5)

(The apparent contradiction here between hearing and reading is probably an indication of the poet's familiarity with both kinds of audience.) Douglas seems to have intended his translation of the Aeneid to be used in schools and "red on hight" to "onletterit folk",⁷¹ but the address to Lord Sinclair,

That Virgill mycht intill our langage be
Red lowd and playn be zour lordschip and me,
And other gentill companzeonys quha sa lyst..

leaves little doubt that the educated as well as the uneducated enjoyed spoken poetry. Dunbar's petitionary poems are the most striking examples of the contribution of the speaking voice to what had been written and revised in

privacy. The "performance" quality of so much Scottish poetry does not imply an inability for private reading in the vernacular: the members of Dunbar's audience, for example, were almost certainly more literate than the courtiers of Richard II.⁷² It is reasonable to infer that at the court of James IV the tradition of recitation before a listening audience was strengthened by the fact that books in the vernacular, whether in Scots or English, were not as readily available as they were in contemporary England. The king, attempting to remedy the short supply of all kinds of written material, authorized Walter Chepman and Andrew Myllar in 1507 to "furnis and bring hame ane prent".

The continuation in Scotland of the tradition of poetry as performance in court circles helps to account for the popularity of dream vision poetry. The sine qua non of the dream vision is the recording of an experience which purports to be the poet's own: the rhetorical strategy is that of a confidence offered by the poet to his audience - "This is how I came to write as I do rather than in any other way". Handled skilfully, this kind of first person framework heightens the verisimilitude of what is told by giving it a dimension of human interest. Chaucer's great achievement in the use of the form handed on to him by the French poets from Guillaume de Lorris to Machaut is to focus attention throughout the poem on the situation of the dreamer, even in passages of description and in lengthy dramatic sequences which do not actively involve him. At

the end of the lengthy "parliament" episode in The Parlement of Foules, for example, there is a return to the predicament of the poet vis à vis "commune profit", and at a less serious level, the eagle's long monologue on sound in The Hous of Fame derives most of its comic force from the poet's eloquent silence. There is very little of this kind of dramatic effect about the "I" of Lydgate's poetry. In his most Chaucerian pieces, The Temple of Glas and The Complaint of the Black Knight, the characterization of the poet is of the most conventional kind. This "I" exists only as a compound of stylized literary characteristics - Lydgate the Courtly Lover - with the result that there is very little sense of dramatic interaction, either between the poet and his subject, or between the poet and his audience. Yet these works are not bad poetry in the way that The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man is: the lifelessness of the narrator, even when he is describing a state of mental and emotional disturbance, must be due in some measure to the fact that Lydgate simply did not know how to translate Chaucer's spoken nuances into poetry for private reading. Pearsall suggests that the diffuseness of sense and the looseness of syntax in Lydgate's verse reflect the persistence into fifteenth century English writing of the stylistic traditions of orally delivered verse,⁷³ but the degree of diffuseness and looseness in the work of Lydgate and his successors is hardly comparable with even the most discursive of the older romances.

In Scots poetry, use of the dream vision convention is

almost invariably accompanied by authorial self-depictions which invite the interest and the involvement of the audience in what is being narrated. The Kingis Quair, The Testament of Cresseid, the Prologue to The Lion and the Mouse, The Palice of Honour, The Thrissil and the Rois, Lindsay's Dreme ... all are works in which a sense of human drama involving the poet is evoked in order to enrich meaning. Detailed discussion of particular poems is reserved for the following chapters, but it may be appropriate to observe at this point that the first person effects in these poems are frequently adaptations of similar passages in Chaucer's poems. The Chaucerian device of the poet's reflections about a newly read book as a way of beginning a poem is used by James I and Henryson; the broadly comic and ironic self-depreciation which has given rise to the term "naïve narrator" finds an appreciative echo in both the Quair and The Palice of Honour; the reluctance pose of The Parlement of Foules and The Hous of Fame is given an original twist by Dunbar in a poem of celebration. These and other instances of direct indebtedness to Chaucer suggest that in his work the Scots poets recognized a poet who, like themselves, was in a position to make dramatic capital out of a special kind of relationship with his audience.

Although Chaucer's poetry is by no means the only influence at work on Scots poetry of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, it served for the makars as a touchstone of artistic excellence. The fact that no Scots

writer was so daunted by Chaucer's example as to fall into the error of servile imitation testifies to the survival of Chaucer's kind of talent in the courts of Scotland. The ability to adapt and select - from Chaucer, from Lydgate, from continental poetry, from earlier writing in Scots - in order to vivify a work with its own "moralite" and tone produces a complex and varied body of poetry which has few points of contact with the literature of England in the same period. It is wholly appropriate that Skelton, the first truly inventive English poet since Chaucer, should have turned to Scottish poetry as part of an effort to infuse some new life into English letters. My concern in the chapters which follow is to show how imaginative the makars were in their borrowings. As long ago as 1908, G. Gregory Smith warned of the dangers of a comparative approach to late medieval Scottish literature:

It has become a commonplace to say of the [Scots] poets that they, best of all Chaucer's followers, fulfilled the lessons of the master-craftsman; and it has long been customary to enforce this by contrasting the skill of Lydgate, Occleve, and their contemporaries in the south, with that of James I, Henryson, Dunbar, and Gavin Douglas. The contrast, however, does not help us to more than a superficial estimate; it may lead us to exaggerate the individual merits of the writers and to neglect such important matters as the homogeneity of their work.⁷⁴

I have tried to give full recognition to the inventiveness of the individual poet, and also to give some indication of that strength of local tradition in the two parts of "Albion iland braid" which makes Scottish literature so different from English work of the same period.

Chapter II

The Kingis Quair in relation to Chaucer and Lydgate.

The Kingis Quair of James I is a court poem, written by the highest "courtman" in the realm for the edification and entertainment of the royal household.¹ There is, admittedly, no external documentary evidence of this, but it is difficult to imagine that a reigning Scots monarch would have addressed a poem based on personal experience to any lesser audience. The work itself contains several allusions to the kind of audience which it assumes: to illustrate the universality of Fortune's operations the ranks of "prynce" and "page" are chosen (st.9); towards the conclusion the poet addresses, echoing Chaucer, his "brethir that bene in this place" (st. 184), and covertly, the queen herself (st.195). The poem implies James's desire to found a tradition of courtly poetry, through Venus's command that her suppliant should encourage the spread of "The songis new, the fresch carolis and dance". That the poem was written in and for a court environment is largely self-evident, but the implications of its provenance may not be so clear. Its original audience would have brought to their experience of the poem a knowledge of its background in the personal experience of the poet, which would have come into force as soon as allusions to the childhood journey, the capture at sea "by fors...Off inymyis", and the imprisonment "Nere by the space of 3eris twise nyne" were made. They would also have appreciated the ingenuity shown in the treatment of historical fact. In the poem James refers to his "folk" (st. 27), the companions of his captivity, some of whom would have been among its first audience - men such as William Giffart, given a pension by the Scots parliament in 1424,² Thomas Myrton, who became treasurer,³ and Walter Ogilvy, who although

never a prisoner himself, was a frequent ambassador during the years of captivity.⁴ (It is no coincidence that the manuscript which contains The Kingis Quair belonged to Henry, Lord St. Clair: his great-grandfather was the Earl of Orkney who led James's escort on the fateful voyage,⁵ while his maternal grandmother was Margaret Douglas, eldest sister of James I.⁶) McDiarmid suggests that in the poem "more might have been made of the eighteen years of exile and frustration".⁷ There are, as we shall see, good aesthetic reasons for the manner in which James chooses to relate his "aventure", but it is also relevant to note here that it would simply not have been necessary for James to enlarge upon his experience, since presumably most of his audience would have been all too familiar with the events of the years 1406-24.

The Kingis Quair is the supreme example of the power of Scots poetry to set itself above and apart from political realities, even though these constitute the necessary conditions for the poem's existence. Most of the details of James I's captivity in England are shrouded in obscurity: it would be naïve to accept Bower's account of Henry IV's beneficence in the education of the king⁸ (as one modern editor does),⁹ when there exist such vivid bits of social history as James's shortage of money¹⁰ and the fact that the bed-linen of one his fellow prisoners had not been renewed for two years.¹¹ Nevertheless, English court life did play a part in his confinement: James was with the court at Croydon in 1412, and later at Windsor;¹² he was at the coronation of Queen

Catherine,¹³ and in 1420 and 1421 was with Henry on campaign in France.¹⁴ Political expediency undoubtedly prompted such public exhibitions of the King of Scots, but it is more important here to observe that although a prisoner, there would have been some opportunity for James to encounter in manuscript or perhaps even in performance such expressions of English culture as the poetry of Chaucer, Lydgate, and other writers. There is no need to assume that the use which James made of this work parallels "E.K.'s" lyrical account of Spenser's indebtedness to Chaucer and Lydgate - "hauing the sound of these auncient Poetes still ringing in his eares, he mought needes in singing hit out some of theyr tunes".¹⁵ Passages in The Kingis Quair are conscious reworkings of similar sections in the work of Chaucer and Lydgate, and from this we must infer that James had with him in Scotland copies of the relevant poems, in manuscripts very similar to that which contains the Quair itself. (It would be surprising if James and his English queen had not taken such items north with them.) There can be no doubt that the Quair was written in Scotland, despite the Selden colophon, "maid quhen his Maiestie was in England". The king and queen came to Scotland only a few weeks after their marriage, and the poem's strongly retrospective tone (e.g. sts. 192-3) is simply not consistent with a date of composition prior to 1424. The poem leaves no doubt that its author was an admirer (albeit a critical one) of the literature of his captors' court, and it reflects his attempt to give his own courtiers a taste of southern standards. The poems of Chaucer were probably known to them already - transmission of texts could have been easily effected through the

channels of diplomatic exchange and correspondence - but until the composition of the Quair there was no Scots work written in accordance with the same artistic principles.

The Kingis Quair is written in the seven-line stanza of Troilus and Criseyde, and contains a wealth of echoes of the language, themes, and devices of a large number of late fourteenth and early fifteenth century poems. The vocabulary of the poem is clearly different from that of the later work of Henryson and Dunbar, which abounds in distinctively Scots dialectal forms. Factors such as these have led commentators to regard it as a southern composition. Skeat described the language of the poem as an "artificial dialect",¹⁶ and in the influential view of Sir William Craigie it is basically Chaucerian English, contaminated by scribal interference.¹⁷ In his study of fifteenth century English poetry, Derek Pearsall refers to "the fact proved by Craigie to the satisfaction of all but the most fanatical Scottophile, that the language of the poem is the Southern English of Chaucer":¹⁸ Craigie's view is also accepted by Norton-Smith¹⁹ and Fox.²⁰ McDiarmid's close and detailed examination of the phonology, accidence, and vocabulary of the Quair demonstrates conclusively, however, that its language is basically Scots "Inglis" with a strong mixture of southern sounds and forms. The southern element is stronger and more noticeable than it is in the work of Henryson, Dunbar, and Douglas, for example, but one does not have to be "the most fanatical Scottophile" to see the poet's strong native linguistic inheritance at work in association with the language of the southern court

and its literature. The accumulation of possessive pronouns in the account of the transition from reading Boethius to creative activity,

Therefore I lat him pas, and in my tong
 Procede I will agayn to my sentence
 Of my mater, and leve all incidence, (st.7, 5-7,
 my italics)²¹

is not simply fortuitous. Despite the preceding disclaimer "my scole is ouer zong", the poet's "sentence" and "mater" are his own, and they are set forth in a language - "my tong" - which would have been familiar to his Scots audience as a heightened form of their own speech. In a sense, the Quair is the equivalent, in poetic terms, of James's attempt to introduce a bicameral parliament on the English model,²² adapted to suit the traditions of his own country. Both poem and legislative reform reflect efforts on the part of the king to enrich his kingdom with some of the more positive knowledge gained from the period of his enforced sojourn in England.

No aspect of the nexus between medieval English and Scottish poetry has been discussed at such length as the relationship between The Kingis Quair and its Middle English antecedents, particularly poems by Chaucer and Lydgate. A considerable amount of this source commentary is indebted to an early study by Henry Wood,²³ although the indebtedness has less frequently been acknowledged. Wood's essay, which contains a detailed account of parallel scenes and verbal echoes of Chaucerian poetry, has been misrepresented by one recent critic who observes, as a criticism of Wood's basic approach, "it is no longer possible to say that James's use

of Chaucer is mechanical".²⁴ Much of Wood's study is concerned with purely verbal parallels, but he does attempt to come to terms with a much more important and fundamental issue, that of a similarity of tone between The Kingis Quair and Chaucer's poetry:

This resemblance between the two is true above all in respect of the general tone of Chaucer's works, of his naturalness, of his strikingly modern expression of feeling. It is here less a question of particular passages, than of Chaucer's whole personality, as we see it in his works. The character which shows itself to us in the King's Quair is a similar one, although not so many sided and far less experienced; and everything indicates that the younger poet felt himself powerfully attracted towards the elder, and educated himself under the influence of the latter's works to ways of thought and expression, to which he otherwise never could have attained in such a degree.²⁵

What is referred to here is a similarity between narrative personae. The matter is not discussed at any length: the implications of the authorial "I" in medieval poetry were not as important to nineteenth century scholars as they are today, since the work of critics such as Donaldson,²⁶ Spearing,²⁷ and Lawlor.²⁸ Wood suggests a greater degree of discipleship to Chaucer than is warranted by the text of the Quair, thereby underestimating the originality of the Scots poem, but nevertheless there is an important resemblance between James's self-depiction and Chaucer's "I". In the Quair, just as in The Parlement of Foules or Troilus and Criseyde, there is a strong sense of the author's continued involvement in the narrative, even in descriptive passages which seem to have no immediate relevance to his stated interests and concerns. There are, as we shall see, parallels to be drawn with works such as the Confessio Amantis and Pearl, but the affinity with Chaucer is more significant because of

James's careful adaptations of passages in Chaucer's poetry. The use to which the first person method is put in the Quair is influenced to a considerable extent by the techniques of late Middle English poetry, but at the same time it illustrates, more than any other aspect of the poem, James's originality and independence. There is little point to be served by listing the correspondences of phrase, image, and various kinds of structural and dramatic device between the Quair and any of several English poems, but in the paragraphs which follow I shall endeavour to relate as many of them as possible to the overall theme of traditionalism and originality in the poet's handling of the first person.

The narrative of the Quair centres upon the experience of one man: the poet tells how, one restless night, he came to a reckoning with himself, by reviewing the outlines of his life to date,

all myn auenture
I gan ourehayle, that langer slepe ne rest
Ne myght I nat, so were my wittis wrest, (st.10, 5-7)

and how reflection was translated into creative activity by the commanding voice of the matins bell²⁹ - "Tell on, man, quhat the befell" (st.11, 7). The earlier reference to the poet's sleeplessness, in stanza 2, shows a knowledge of the technique of self-introduction which Chaucer uses in The Book of the Duchess. There, by hinting at an interesting personal history, the poet sharpens the interest of his audience in the narrative to come - we feel that this must have some bearing on the speaker's state of mind. The same kind of effect is created by the passage in the Quair, although there is the



important difference that James excludes from his self-introduction all of the ambiguity which surrounds Chaucer's account of his sleeplessness. Instead of mystifying allusions to a "seknesse", the cause of the sleeplessness is dealt with in a comparatively dismissive way:

Fell me to mynd of many diuerse thing,
Off this and that, can I nought say quharefore
Bot slepe for craft in erth myght I nò more. (st.2, 2-5)

From the beginning of the poem, James places the narrative of his personal "aventure" within a framework of wider human experience. One of the ways in which this is done is through the account of the reading which the poet does to alleviate his sleeplessness. The idea of taking up a book, like the motif of sleeplessness, is borrowed from Chaucer - from The Book of the Duchess and The Parlement of Foules.³⁰ Like Chaucer, James uses it as part of a sententia, the general potentialities of which are explained thus by Geoffroi de Vinsauf in the Poetria Nova:

If the first part of the work aims at even greater splendour..... let a well-known sententia incline in no respect to the particular, but rather raise its head higher, to something universal Let the sententia stand above the given theme, but glance straight at it; let it say nothing outright, but develop its thought therefrom.³¹

The allusion to Boethius, whose virtuous youth "Was in his age the ground of his delytis" (st.6, 2) is seen to be particularly appropriate as a counterpoint to the poet's own experience, as MacQueen points out.³² James's use of De Consolatione is much more directly related to thematic concerns than is Chaucer's rambling and facetious treatment of Ovid in The Book of the Duchess: it has more in common with the account of the Somnium Scipionis in The Parlement

of Foules, which introduces the theme of the relation between individual desire and common profit, amplified in the following section of the poem. The Quair differs radically from both Chaucerian poems, however, in the clear and unequivocal way in which it relates what is read to the career of the narrator. In the Parlement, Chaucer is unwilling to commit himself to the extent of admitting that his own professed disquiet, expressed so memorably in the introductory stanzas, is connected either with his choice of reading or with the subsequent "sweven": in the end, the reader is left to infer for himself the nature of that "certeyn thing" which the poet was so anxious to learn (20). By contrast, the author of the Quair is concerned to explain precisely why a reading of Boethius brought about not sleep, but a renewed state of intellectual ferment. He ponders the general moral proposition of the unreliability of Fortune:

For sothe It is, that on hir tolter quhele
 Euery wight cleuerith in his stage,
 And failying foting oft quhen hir lest rele,
 Sum vp, sum doune; is none estate nor age
 Ensured more, the prynce than the page,
 So vncouthly hir werdes sche deuidith,
 Namly in 3outh that seildin ought prouidith. (st.9)

Having resolved to write a poetic account of his own experience, he returns to this theme of Youth's vulnerability to the assaults of Fortune as a way of beginning his "buke" (sts.14-15). The point that his own experience illustrates the general proposition, and hence that he intends his audience to see him as a typical human figure, is made very clearly:

I mene this by my self as in partye.
 Though nature gave me suffisance in 3outh,
 The rypenesse of resoune lakkit I
 To governe with my will.. (st.16, 1-4)

James's purposefulness as a narrator is in marked contrast

to the ethos of the Chaucerian narrator. In the Quair, reading is not conducive to the passive state of dreaming as it is in The Book of the Duchess and the Parlement, but rather to the strenuous business of writing.

I have suggested that the Quair resembles poems by Chaucer in the strong sense of the poet's continued involvement in the narrative which it conveys. It is equally important to recognize that the quality of the authorial involvement in the Quair is different from that of Chaucer's dream visions or of Troilus and Criseyde. As a narrator, James is much more explicit and direct about morals and ethics, and in this respect he resembles Gower and Lydgate rather than Chaucer, whose habitual stance is one of detachment and scepticism about the moral issues raised by his poems. The Chaucerian position is such as to induce the reader to draw his own conclusions from the various groupings of "matere" within each poem: for example, in the Parlement, about whether it is possible for any reconciliation between sensual love and the common good to be made. A complementary aspect of Chaucer's withdrawal is his unwillingness, as a character within his own dream visions, to be involved in action or "experience" of any kind - one thinks immediately of the dreamer's fear outside the gate to the garden of love in the Parlement, and his extreme reluctance to be carried aloft to the abode of Fame. The rhetorical strategy of the Quair is in this respect much closer to that of Gower's Confessio Amantis. In Book I, comments on the blinding and binding properties of love are followed by the poet's declaration

that his own experience qualifies him to be a teacher and exemplar to "hem that ben lovers aboute":³³

Fro point to point I wol declare

.....
 That every man ensample take
 Of wisdom which him is betake,
 And that he wot of good aprise
 To teche it forth, for such emprise
 Is forto praise; and therfore I
 Woll wryte and schewe al openly
 How love and I togedre mette,
 Wherof the world ensample fette
 Mai after this, whan I am go,
 Of thilke unsely jolif wo.

(73-88)

The view of love which emerges from the Confessio Amantis is of course more sober than the "sentence" of the Quair, but the same kind of rhetorical technique is used in both poems - the poet is shown to be the subject of universal moral laws. In the Quair there are no close verbal echoes of the Confessio as there are of poems by Chaucer, but no doubt James's acknowledgement of Gower reflects his sympathy with the latter's treatment of the relation between love, fortune, and moral virtue. The idea that a poet's self-presentation should illustrate and amplify aspects of universal moral principles is not restricted to the Quair and the Confessio Amantis: the poet-figures in Pearl and Piers Plowman, for example, are depicted in such a way that they illustrate man's struggle to comprehend the meaning of salvation. In all of these poems, the "typical" poet-figures are shown with some individuating detail, but particularity is never allowed to obscure their general applicability. It will be necessary to return to the question of realism and universality again, but here I am more concerned to stress that Chaucer's various self-depictions are different from those of other late medieval poets in that they emphasize the particular rather than the general. It is

impossible, for example, to classify the dreamer in The Book of the Duchess, The Parlement of Foules, The House of Fame, or the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women, as an embodiment of Youth, or the model Courtly Lover, or even as an Everyman figure. Neither is he simply a naïf or a buffoon, as some commentators have suggested: there are elements of naïveté and buffoonery, but the figure who awakens with such serious perplexity in the Parlement, and who dissociates himself from those who pay court to Fame, defies simple categorization. As a narrator, too (i.e. outside the dramatic "action" of the various dreams), Chaucer again and again prefers irony and ambiguity to clear statements of commitment to any systematic view of experience.

The unique rhetorical strategy of Chaucer's dream vision poetry exists in securing the maximum possible involvement of his audience (readers as well as listeners), by the infusion of his complex authorial personality - by turns timorous, puzzled, flippant, and assuredly serious - without providing authoritative comment on the moral issues which the poems raise. The dream vision allegories of Chaucer's contemporaries and successors often avoid the aesthetic ungainliness of authorial moralizing by the introduction of authority figures drawn from legend and mythology, Christian or pagan. Chaucer avoids even this kind of explicitness, although like other poets he exploits the dramatic possibilities of the dialogue between authority figure and poet-dreamer. His dream visions differ from others in that they contain no figures who speak with the finality of, for example, Holy Church in Piers

Plowman, the maiden in Pearl, Venus in Confessio Amantis, or the goddesses in The Kingis Quair: Africanus, Dame Nature, Jove's eagle, and the God of Love give the poet advice, but in each case there are ironies at work which make them less authoritative than their counterparts in more conventional poems. In only one place - the conclusion of Troilus and Criseyde - does Chaucer come out with a clear and strong affirmation of moral principle, that the love of God exceeds and circumscribes the love of man. Human love is not condemned because it is natural, and therefore part of the divine scheme: it "up groweth" in the manner of the "floures faire". But like the flowers, such love is transitory, and in comparison with the enduring bond of love between God and man it can be described appropriately as "feynede" (1835-48). In his concluding stanzas Chaucer defines human love sub specie aeternitatis, but there is nothing here which is incongruous with the attitude to love expressed less directly in the earlier part of the poem. The poet's attitude to love and to lovers is made plain at the beginning of his narrative, in the bidding prayer for lovers (15-51). This passage is reworked by James towards the end of the Quair (sts. 184-6), and although many commentators have drawn attention to the sustained echo of Troilus and Criseyde,³⁴ there has been no appreciation of the critical purpose underlying the reworking. It is impossible to know for certain whether the first audience of the Quair recognized the delicate and witty commentary on Chaucer's attitude to love, but it is likely that they had the same knowledge of Troilus and Criseyde which Henryson was to assume in his audience some fifty years later.

The key to Chaucer's relationship to his subject matter is given by his clever parody of the papal title, "servus servorum Dei":³⁵

For I, that God of Loves servantz serve,
 Ne dar to Love, for myn unliklynese,
 Preyen for speed, al sholde I therfore sterve,
 So fer am I from his help in derknesse. (I, 15-18)

This implies not only a priestly lack of direct experience but also an authority to make pronouncements on matters of love which is of the same order as the pope's authority to make pronouncements on matters of faith. The poet remains aloof from the joys and sorrows of "Loves folk", and it is for this reason rather than because of his "unliklynese" that he does not pray himself to the "God of Love". (The nearest he comes to a commitment to experience is the exclamation during the account of the Trojan lovers' "hevene blisse" in Book III - "Why nad I swich oon with my soule ybought..?") The deity in whose service Chaucer writes is addressed variously as "God", "God of Love", and "Love", and this has the effect of suggesting that there may be a direct relationship between secular and Christian love. This suggestion is confirmed at the conclusion of the poem, where it is made clear that human love is divinely ordained. "Trouthe in love" is a state to be striven for and cherished when found, but the high priest of love can offer the men and women of his audience little hope for enduring and honest sexual relationships.

The point of the reworking of Chaucer's introduction in The Kingis Quair is to display secular love in a different

perspective. James's attitude to his subject matter implies criticism of Chaucer's posture as narrator. Unlike his predecessor, James addresses the love deity directly:

Beseching vnto fair Venus abufe
For all my brethir that bene in this place,
This is to seyne, that seruandis ar to lufe.. (st.184, 1-3)

His conception of brotherhood is less equivocal than that of Chaucer's "I", who will show only the detached solicitude of a "brother dere". The narrator of the Quair is one who has experienced love himself - in both its joyful and its sorrowful aspects - and this direct experience is opposed to the Chaucerian aloofness. A pontifical authority in the affairs of lovers is inadequate: the actual experience provides a more trustworthy authority. James's use of Chaucer's lines,

For so hope I my sowle best avaunce,
To prey for hem that Loves servauntz be,
And write hire wo, and lyve in charite, (47-9)

is very illuminating:

And eke I pray for all the hertis dull,
That lyven here in sleuth and ignorance
And has no curage at the rose to pull,
Thair lif to mend, and thair saulis auance
With thair suete lore, and bring thame to gude chance.

(st.186, 1-5; my italics)

Chaucer is here consigned to the company of those with "hertis dull". James wittily suggests that his predecessor, as a mere mortal, claims too much for himself by adopting a papal charity towards lovers, and that the human soul can be better advanced by submitting to the experience of love. Whereas Chaucer can offer only the consolation of other-worldly felicity to those unhappy in love ("So graunte hem soone owt of this world to pace"), the fortunate lover-poet of the Quair offers the hope of grace in this world. Not surprisingly, he shares Chaucer's

sentiment towards lovers who are "at ese", using almost the identical words - "To graunt thame all, lo, gude perseuerance" (cf. TC, "That God hem graunte ay good perseverance").

James's prayer for lovers is, like the introduction and the conclusion of Chaucer's poem, a way of showing the applicability of the story to the lives of the audience. The two poems reach the same philosophical position - i.e., that human love is a natural and desirable thing, providing that there is a recognition of the transcending power of Christian love. But where Chaucer lays the emphasis of his "moralitee" upon the great difficulty of winning the "hevene" of honest sexual love from which the lover may progress to the Christian heaven, James is concerned to show that the search for a worldly felicity similar to his own is well worth making. It is not too much to say that his adaptation of Chaucer's lines effectively redresses the balance of Troilus and Criseyde. The Kingis Quair demonstrates that not all women are Cressids, and that the fulfilment of an honest desire can be achieved by every lover. James's concern is with the flower of love "that now from day to day/ Flourith ay newe" (st.193, 6-7), whereas Chaucer's is with the symbolic meaning of the flower's decay.

The last seventeen stanzas of the Quair, and the prayer for lovers in particular, illustrate a compelling feature of the poet's manner, which can be defined as a sense of wise and amiable retrospection. It is this factor which enriches the elegant cadences of the Chaucerian prayer. The poet has a particular kind of authority to beseech Venus to help

others, because he has actually encountered her in his dream, and also because he himself has passed through most of the experiences of love mentioned in the prayer - being in love with a lady who seems unattainable, being either ignorant of love or afraid of it, being within imminent reach of fulfillment. From the beginning of the poem we are made aware that the narrator speaks with the wisdom of experience: this is the effect created by his musings on Fortune,

Fell me to mynd of my fortune and vre,
In tender youth how sche was first my fo,
And eft my frende, and how I gat recure
Off my distresse.. (st.10, 2-5)

and by the subsequent moralizing about Youth's susceptibility to the attacks of Fortune. The distance between present and past levels of understanding is given dramatic emphasis in James's depiction of himself as a young man. In passages of direct speech the youthful prisoner is "characterized" through style: his despair and lack of knowledge are dramatically embodied in short, interrogative periods. From his "strayte ward", he laments the apparent cruelty of Fortune,

Quhat schall I seyne, quhat resoune may I fynd
That fortune suld do so? (st.27, 4-5)

After hearing the birds' paeon to Love, he questions again,

Quhat luf is this that makis birdis dote?
Quhat may this be, how cummyth it of ought?
Quhat nedith it to be so dere ybought? (st.36, 3-5)

A similar series of urgent questions marks his response to the sight of the lady in the garden (sts.42-3), and to the nightingale who apparently refuses to sing (sts.57-8). The sequence culminates in an impassioned questioning of the very value of life,³⁶

Than said I thus, "Quhareto lyve I langer,
Wofullest wicht and subiect vnto peyne?

Of peyne, no! God wote, 3a, for thay no stranger
 May wirken ony wight, I dare wele seyne!
 How may this be, that deth and lyf, bothe tueyne,
 Sall bothe atonis in a creature
 Togidder duell, and turment thus nature? (st.68)

The double sorrow of the youthful prisoner is evoked with some immediacy and realism, but at the same time the figure has an allegorical function. He is a member of that large fraternity of courtly lovers in medieval literature, and as such his characteristics - single-minded devotion to the lady, a sense of isolation, readiness to despair - are similar to those of the hero of the Rose, Gower's Amans, Chaucer's Troilus and the Man in Black, and the unfortunate lovers of Lydgate's The Temple of Glas. Even the combination of physical imprisonment and subjection to love has a literary precedent in The Knight's Tale. In each poem there is a young prisoner who sees in May from his place of incarceration a young woman walking in an adjoining garden. So beautiful is she that the prisoner mistakes her for a goddess. Palamon exclaims "I noot wher she be wooman or goddesse,/ But Venus it is soothly, as I gesse" (1101-2): James's "I" asks,

A, suete, ar 3e a warldly creature,
 Or hevinly thing in liknesse of nature?
 Or ar 3e god Cupidis owin princesse,
 And cummyn are to louse me out of band? (st.42, 6-7;
 st.43, 1-2)

Both poems introduce the paradox that falling in love appears to worsen the plight of the prisoner: Palamon laments that his torment has been doubled, while the prisoner in the Scots poem complains that life will have no further point if Venus does not intervene (st.69).

The first encounter of James I with Joan Beaufort almost

certainly did not take place in the extravagantly literary circumstances outlined in the Quair, and it is surely reasonable to assume that here reality has been bypassed to make the experience intelligible to the poet's audience, and to enable the audience to make a ready identification, on the basis of their familiarity with other courtly poems, with the lover-prisoner in the poem. James's use of literary convention to create a generalized portrait of himself is illustrated not only by his use of The Knight's Tale, but also by his reworking of a passage in the fifteenth century English poem The Flower of Courtesy, ascribed by John Stow to Lydgate.³⁷ Here the poet represents himself as the suffering lover of literary convention, drawing a contrast between his own painful introspection on St. Valentine's day and the spontaneous joy of the birds,

alas! what may this be,
That every foul hath his libertee
Frely to chesen after his desyre
Everich his make thus, fro yeer to yere? (53-6)

But man aloon, alas! the harde stounde!
Ful cruelly, by kyndes ordinaunce,
Constrayned is, and by statut bounde,
And debarred from alle such plesaunce.
What meneth this? What is this purveyaunce
Of god above, agayn al right of kynde,
Withoute cause, so narewe man to bynde? (64-70)

He goes on to lament the "fellness" of Fortune. James has adapted this passage, as the prisoner's complaint about the loss of his freedom makes clear,

Quhat haue I gilt to faille
My fredome in this world and my plesance,
Sen euery wight has thereof suffisance
That I behold, and I, a creature,
Put from all this? Hard is myn auenture!
The bird, the beste, the fisch eke in the see,
They lyve in fredome, euerich in his kynd,
And I, a man, and lakkith libertee!

Quhat schall I seyne, quhat resoune may I fynd
That fortune suld do so? (st.26, 3-7; st.27, 1-5)

The lament in the Quair has a greater dramatic impact than its model, partly because it is more concise, partly because of its context in a developing human drama. (The Flower of Courtesy is a rather static dramatic monologue.) The solitary outpourings of the young man in the Quair are carefully organized. The passage adapted from the Flower refers specifically to his literal loss of liberty through imprisonment: it is followed by musings about the relationship between liberty and love (sts.37-8), which conclude with the resolution that he would be prepared to serve that Lord who has the power "To bynd and lous" (st.39, 3). After seeing the lady and submitting willingly to Love, he laments because his imprisonment now seems to be an obstacle to a specific kind of freedom, the freedom to pursue his love-suit (sts.68-70).

Norton-Smith has quite justifiably been criticized by McDiarmid³⁸ for his remark about the "naïve authorial charm"³⁹ of The Kingis Quair. It is the figure of the poet as a dramatic character - as the prisoner-lover of recollected experience - who exerts this kind of appeal, rather than the poet who interprets his experience from the vantage point of wise and contented maturity. In order to amplify the point which he makes at the beginning of the poem about "sely 3outh", James characterizes his recollected self through a certain kind of rhetorical excess, which is in part modelled on his knowledge of literary love-complaints, such as those of The Flower of Courtesy and The Knight's Tale. The voice of the prisoner who becomes a supplicant to the triad of

deities is always full of urgency, an effect produced by an extensive use of exclamation and question. We smile, along with the poet, at the lover's envy of his lady's "lytill hound",

Than wold I say, and sighe therewith alyte,
 "A, wele were him, that now were in thy plyte!"
 (st.53, 6-7)

and at the immediate reversion to the mode of agitated questioning when he awakes "Fulfilld of thoght",⁴⁰

"A! merci, lord, quhat will ze do with me?
 Quhat lyf is this? Quhare hath my spirit be?
 Is this of my forethought impressioun,
 Or is it from the hevin a visioun?" (st.175, 4-7)

This passage shows the influence of The Hous of Fame, where the dreamer exclaims in astonishment, "O Crist! .. that art in blysse,/ Fro fantome and illusion/ Me save!" (492-4).

The exclamatory tenor of the prisoner-lover's rhetoric is not carried to such an extreme that he is made to appear ridiculous. At only one point during the poem does the young man become a figure of fun, in the account of the exchange between him and the goddess Fortune, which is inspired by a scene in The Parlement of Foules. The dreamer's guide Africanus is clearly amused by his pupil's fear and inability to take any positive course of action, and he provides some humorous reassurance,

It stondeth writen in thy face,
 Thyn errour, though thou telle it not to me;
 But dred the not to come into this place,
 For this writyng nys nothyng ment bi the,
 Ne by non, but he Loves servaunt be:
 For thou of love hast lost thy tast, I gesse,
 As sek man hath of swete and bytternesse.
 But natheles, although that thou be dul,
 Yit that thou canst not do, yit mayst thou se. (155-63)

James's appreciation of Chaucer's self-depreciation may be

seen in the goddess Fortune's wry amusement at her supplicant's earnestness. After making a rather obvious pun from the chess metaphor with which he ends his plea,⁴¹ she suggests that he might just as well have kept silent,

"Off mate?" quod sche. "O verray sely wreche!
I se wele by thy dedely colour pale,
Thou art to feble of thy self to streche,
Vpon my quhele to clymbe or to hale
Withoutin help, for thou has fundin stale
This mony day withoutin warldis wele,
And wantis now thy veray hertis hele." (st.169)

In both passages, the idea of ennui caused by deprivation of the "taste" of love is treated humorously. The parallel with the Parlement is continued in the comically undignified treatment meted out to the dreamers by their respective guides. Chaucer is "shof in at the gates wide" by Africanus (154), while Fortune's pupil receives equally undignified but more painful treatment,

"Fare wele," quod sche, and by the ere me toke
So earnestly that therewithall I woke, (st.172, 6-7)

Elsewhere James does not attempt this kind of broad humour, but the overtly Chaucerian treatment of the narrator does nothing to detract from the seriousness of the quest or from the tonal unity of the poem.

The difference between the narrator's present and past levels of awareness is most clearly seen when we set some of the generalizing, sententious utterances of the stanzas at the beginning and end of the poem beside passages of direct speech or soliloquy contained in the recollected drama of imprisonment and liberation. The retrospective quality of the poem is of course much more thorough and pervasive than a simple comparison of rhetorical styles would suggest.

The distance between wise maturity and "sely 3outh" is suggested, for example, in the two attitudes to Fortune expressed within twenty lines. In the present, the narrator understands the intransigence of worldly affairs made manifest in his capture so long ago - "Fortune it schupe non othir wayis to be" (st.24, 7): at the time, though, he was ignorant of Fortune's nature - "Quhat resoune may I fynd/ That fortune suld do so?" (st.27, 4-5). The wry comment on the series of agonized complaints - "bot all for noght" (st.27, 6) - and the philosopher's insistence that he submitted to love "of free wyll" (st.41, 6), create a similar effect. Just as the mature narrator is capable of a sympathetic involvement with his youthful self, the young lover survives in the man who reads Boethius and moralizes about the ignorance of Youth. Some of his exclamations about past experience suggest that he is imaginatively reliving it as he writes - e.g., "O happy exercise" (st.29, 5),⁴² and "Now, gif there was gud partye, god it wote!" (st.48, 7), and the series of "inset" poetic tributes after stanza 189 leave no doubt that he has retained the enthusiasm of youth. One of James's principal achievements is the creation of a persona which convincingly illustrates the distance between maturity and youth, but at the same time has a consistency and continuity which give a sense of realistic depth to the portrait. In comparison, Gower's self-presentation in Confessio Amantis is stilted and unconvincing. Like James, Gower is concerned to demonstrate the necessity for a proper balance between reason and the demands of the heart, but despite the moving self-recognition scene of Book VIII there is a wide gap

between Gower as Amans, the impossibly naïve character in a recollected experience, and Gower as moral philosopher, the sage figure who gives his audience sound advice at the beginning and end of the narrative proper.

The inspiration of autobiography is undoubtedly an important aspect of James's rhetorical technique, but I have suspended discussion of it because it is obvious that the poet chose to subordinate the details of "real-life" experience to a more generalized kind of self-representation. There can be no doubt that many of the details of the narrative are drawn from the personal experience of James I, King of Scots - for example, the departure from his country as a child, the capture at sea, the eighteen years imprisonment, the company of his own people, and the love-suit associated with his liberation from captivity. It is important to recognize these facts for what they are, but it is equally important to understand the manner in which autobiographical truth is selected and formalized to enrich the texture of a poem which sets out to demonstrate the universal applicability of an individual "aventure". The treatment of autobiographical reality owes something to the conventions of fourteenth century English narrative poetry, of works such as Pearl, Confessio Amantis, and Piers Plowman. It is not possible to prove that Pearl is based on a real father's grief for a lost child, but allusions such as "Ho wat3 me nerre þen aunte or nece" (233) and "þou lyfed not two 3er in our þede"⁴³ (483) are most satisfactorily explained as references to a real person, a real event in the life of the poet. (The realism

of the poem's human drama does not in itself prove that it is based on literal fact.) The "sentence" of the poem is articulated through the central poetic fiction of a dream dialogue between the narrator and an otherworldly maiden, who attempts to teach him a lesson about the nature of human grief and salvation: the poem is charged with emotion, but this should not prevent us from seeing that the "I" of the poet is essentially a generalized and symbolic figure, a representation of the erring human will which attempts to defy the voice of divinely-appointed Reason. So also in Piers Plowman the dreamer's confession to Reason in Passus VI of the C-text contains elements which are most readily explicable in terms of autobiographical fact,⁴⁴ and these give a strong air of verisimilitude to the narrative. It is important to recognize, however, that Will is not consistently depicted in this way: for most of the poem he is shown as an impossibly naïve Everyman figure, capable of asking questions such as "What is holychurche, frend?"⁴⁵ In portraying himself as Amans in the Confessio, Gower presents the image of the conventional courtly lover, simple and singleminded in his devotion to the lady. By giving the character his own name (Book VIII, 2321, 2908), Gower offers himself as an example to his audience, inviting them to recognize that it is proper for a man of his advancing years to study not the craft of love, but books of "vertu moral". Like Langland and the author of Pearl, Gower creates a persona who is both individual and type, with the aid of realistic circumstantial and psychological detail which does not necessarily reflect autobiography: in each case, the emphasis is on the exemplary,

the universal quality of the authorial portrait.⁴⁶

Since James mentions Gower at the end of the Quair, he was presumably familiar with the Confessio Amantis: in the absence of verbal parallels, it would be unwise to assume that he had a knowledge of Pearl and Piers Plowman. Comparison with the Quair is, however, relevant, since the general approach to autobiography taken by James is essentially similar to that followed by the other three poets. His picture of himself as a suffering lover is convincing enough, but its naturalism is the product not only of actual personal experience, but also of a sensitive reading of late medieval courtly love literature, of works such as the Confessio Amantis and The Knight's Tale. Similarly, his treatment of his own life reflects no egotistical urge towards self-expression, but rather a desire that his own experience should be seen as a mirror in which his audience can discern something relevant to themselves: in other words, the portrait of the poet is designed to attract a substantial degree of involvement from its audience. There is just enough personal fact to give the poem an interesting verisimilitude - if the poet had been more explicit, it would doubtless have been more difficult for his audience to see the "aventure" as having a universal significance concerned with the enriching potential of human love for an individual who is sufficiently self-aware to recognize that the power of God controls his fortune. The originality of James's story is its very nature: the way in which it is recorded, while not being narrowly imitative or derivative, is clearly in the tradition

of other late medieval treatments of autobiographical reality. The Romantic notion of the intimate , exclusively poetic autobiography would of course have been completely foreign to a fifteenth century poet.

Modern criticism has been reluctant to see the "I" of the Quair in the context of autobiography in late Middle English dream vision poetry. Most commentators have been swayed by the rhetoric of C.S. Lewis, who sees in the Quair "the poetry of marriage emerging from the poetry of adultery":⁴⁷

In our own language, the author, who had long desired to write but spent much ink and paper "to lyte effect", had suddenly perceived that his own story, even as it stood in real life, might pass without disguise into poetry.⁴⁸

This is extraordinary, first because of the poet's deliberate use of poetic convention in his self-representation, secondly because the poem says nothing directly about marriage and very little about wooing. McDiarmid accepts Lewis's view, however, taking Preston and MacQueen to task for what he regards to be their excessively "philosophical" interpretations. (Nevertheless, he tacitly accepts the position of Preston, MacQueen, and Markland,⁴⁹ that Boethian thought is central to the argument of the poem.) The complaint that "What is notably missing from these and other such accounts is the author and subject of the Quair, James Stewart",⁵⁰ leads to a lengthy Skeatian paraphrase of the narrative. The point of this exercise would seem to be not, as the writer says, to explain "a circular course of experience and learning, from a beginning in thoughtless innocence through self-willed and rebellious unreason to a new beginning in Christ-

ian reason",⁵¹ but rather to reinforce his own view that autobiography lies at the very heart of the poem's meaning. Going even further than C.S. Lewis, McDiarmid is quite emphatic that all references to the outcome of the love-quest should be understood in terms of Christian marriage. Thus the meaning of Venus's injunction to the dreamer (st.123) must be "Obey my law and when you have left the world you and your wife will share my heaven perpetually",⁵² the gilly-flower must mean the "queen's flower",⁵³ and "lufis 3ok" (st.193, 2) must mean marriage specifically.⁵⁴ The poet probably did have marriage in mind when he wrote, but there is a deliberate ambiguity in his choice of language. Thus the phrase "lufis 3ok" includes not only marriage, but also any virtuous bond which exists before or apart from marriage. Curiously, McDiarmid notes that it occurs in The Cuckoo and the Nightingale as a description of marriage.⁵⁵ But Clanvowe's poem⁵⁶ has no framework of religious reference at all, and certainly it contains not the slightest suggestion of matrimony: when the Cuckoo avows "For myn entent is neither for to dye,/ Ne, whyl I live, in loves yok to drawe" (139-40), he is expressing no more than his disapproval of "loves servaunts", the followers of the Nightingale. James's allusion to his "souirane" (st.181, 7) is equally ambiguous: it may mean "queen", as McDiarmid says it does,⁵⁷ but on the other hand it carries unmistakable overtones of the lady's place in the courtly love relationship. It should be obvious that the poet places a barrier between himself and his audience, in order to induce them to identify with him not only on the basis of their personal knowledge of his career

and his domestic felicity, but also on the basis of his appeal as a convincing exemplar of familiar aspirations and states of mind. McDiarmid is right to stress James's achievement in electing to base a philosophical poem on the circumstances of his own life, but his insistent interpretations of details within the narrative show an inadequate understanding of the carefully wrought generality of the poet's technique.

I have tried to show that James's handling of autobiography in the Quair has affinities with that of poets other than Chaucer. Where Chaucer does divulge information about himself - for example, his name and employment in The House of Fame, a summary of his literary tastes in the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women, his personal appearance in the Prologue to Sir Thopas - the effect is not to give depth to the illustration of a "moralitee". James's method of combining fact with poetic fiction and convention may, however, owe something to Chaucer's handling of biography (not his own) in The Book of the Duchess, which celebrates the relationship between John of Gaunt and his recently deceased wife Blanche, the "goode faire White." Chaucer, like James, invests the real lover with the salient qualities of the traditional courtly lover, and as part of this process he depicts John of Gaunt as a young man.⁵⁸ So in the Quair the poet depicts himself as a young man, although at the time of his marriage he was almost thirty - this, in the medieval scheme of ages, was the time of approaching middle age. In The Book of the Duchess Chaucer makes no overt reference to marriage, the relationship between the bereaved knight and his lady

being evoked in terms of an "atempre" form of courtly love. (It is interesting to observe that the lover in the Quair, like Chaucer's man in black, speaks with the authority of subsequent experience in commending the "mesure" of his lady; st.50, 6.) Chaucer's method may have been partly motivated by tactful respect for a patron's sorrow, but it does have the additional effect of generalizing the situation described so that an inclusive statement about the nature of suffering and loss emerges from the dialogue between narrator and knight. The love relationship in the Quair is evoked within the framework of amour courtois and the "I" of the poem, like Chaucer's knight, describes his responses in terms of humble service to the lady. He vows to Minerva,

For oure all thing, lo, this were my gladnesse,
To sene the fresche beautee of hir face,
And gif I might deserue, be processe
For my grete lufe and treuth to stond in grace,
Hir worschip sauf; lo here the blisfull cace
That I wold ask... (st.143, 1-6)

It is possible that part of James's interest in Chaucer's poem stemmed from his interest in the real people to whom it refers so obliquely. Joan Beaufort was the daughter of John, Earl of Somerset, the son of John and Blanche of Lancaster,⁵⁹ and it is more than likely that she had a special interest in a famous poem which alluded to her grandparents.

It may be useful to provide at this point a resume of the most significant ways in which James draws upon English poetry for his self-depiction. In a general way, the narrator in the Quair resembles those of Confessio Amantis, Piers Plowman, and Pearl in that, unlike the Chaucerian "I", he is a universal, everyman figure rather than an idiosyncratic

individual. The use which is made of autobiographical detail is also in accordance with the practice of these poets rather than Chaucer, although James's invention in subordinating real life experience to poetic convention, and in creating an effect of continuous retrospection, should not be underestimated. The depiction of the suffering lover in the Quair reflects a close knowledge of Middle English courtly love complaint, and the verbal resemblances are sufficiently close to suggest that The Knight's Tale and The Flower of Courtesy are particular sources. The poet draws here not only from personal experience, but also from a naturalism handed down by literary convention. The poetry of Chaucer is the most important single influence on the authorial portrait in the Quair, despite the fact that the overall typicality of James's "I" is not a Chaucerian feature. The Scots poet reworks a characteristically Chaucerian manner of introduction for the beginning of his own poem, and there is a strong hint of Chaucerian buffoonery in the Fortune's wheel episode. Further, James is sufficiently interested by the stance which Chaucer adopts throughout most of Troilus and Criseyde to be moved to criticize its disengagement. His own moral positivism and commitment as a narrator ally him with poets such as Gower and Lydgate, but the ease and intimacy with which he expresses his attitude is more reminiscent of Chaucer's manner.

The prayer for lovers is not the only instance of a reworking of Chaucer's poetry to bring out a significance which is different from that of the original. James's use

of The Knight's Tale has already been observed, but it is obvious that there is a crucial difference between Palamon and the lover in the Quair. Chaucer emphasizes the pain that falling in love brings to Palamon and Arcite: both of them are "hurt" and "wounded" by the sight of Emilye (1096, 1115-16). Furthermore, they are instantly conquered by love, and Arcite's lament suggests that man is to be regarded as the powerless prey of an essentially malignant fate - "We faren as he that dronke is as a mous" (1234-74). By contrast, as Lewis observes,⁶⁰ falling in love is for the lover in the Quair an essentially genial experience,

And though I stude abaisit tho alyte,
No wonder was, for quhy my wittis all
Were so ouercome with plesance and delyte,
Onely throu latting of myn eyen fall,
That sudaynly my hert become hir thrall
For euer of free wyll, for of manace
There was no takyn in hir suet^e face. (st.41)

The element of free will is James's main alteration to the treatment of Fortune in The Knight's Tale. Yet another juxtaposition of optimism against Chaucerian pessimism is provided by the description of Venus's temple in the Quair,

And in a retrete lytill of compas,
Depeyntit all with sighis wonder sad,
Nought suich sighis as hertis doith manace
Bot suich as dooth lufaris to be glad,
Fond I Venus vpon hir bed... (st.96, 1-5)

These lines are modelled equally on the descriptions of Venus's temple in The Knight's Tale and The Parlement of Foules:

First in the temple of Venus maystow se
Wroght on the wal, ful pitous to biholde,
The broken slepes, and the sikes colde,
The sacred teeris, and the waymentynge,
The firy strokes of the desiryng
That loves servantz in this lyf enduren.. (KnT, 1918-23)

Withinne the temple, of sykes hoote as fyr
 I herde a swogh that gan aboute renne,
 Which sikes were engendered with desyr,
 That maden every auter for to brenne
 Of newe flaume, and wel espyed I thenne
 That al the cause of sorwes that they drye
 Cam of the bittere goddesse Jelosye. (PF, 246-52)

Again, this is evidence of the poet's remoulding of his sources to show love in its positive aspect. Wood (referring only to The Knight's Tale) remarks that "comparison of these passages shows that King James in this case criticizes the model he uses, for the significance of the 'sighis wonder sad' is quite different from that in Chaucer".⁶¹

There are a number of other passages in the Quair which have been modelled upon the work of Chaucer and Lydgate to develop the theme of Fortune's operations as they apply to lovers. Some of these instances of indebtedness are more particular than others, in the same way that some aspects of James's method of self-representation can be more directly related to a particular source than others. The most extended passage of close borrowing is the description of the inhabitants of Venus's "glade empire" (sts.77-93), which has been developed from Lydgate's account of the temple of glass, in the poem of that name (TG, 44-246).⁶² Both are passages of observation, in which the narrator tells of something which he saw in a dream vision, as a way of amplifying and extending the significance of what purports to be personal experience. The "I as observer" device is of course quite conventional, although the uses to which it is put by medieval poets are many and various. In the first part of the Roman de la Rose, for example, the account of

the "portraits" which Amans beholds on the wall of the garden set love within the context of harsh reality. In The Parlement of Foules, Chaucer uses the dreamer's vision of the two garden scenes (Venus's temple and the parliament) to amplify his theme of the problematical relationship between love and the common good. So too in Pearl a vision of the New Jerusalem - symbol of an eternal durability and richness beyond man's full comprehension - is vouchsafed to the grief-stricken narrator. In these poems, what is seen and commented upon is shown to bear a vital relationship to the quests for knowledge in which the various poet-figures are engaged, and in each case the tendency to amplify and universalize is controlled so that it does not obliterate the central dramatic situation of a single figure's quest for truth. The passage in the Quair has this kind of appropriateness. Unlike Lydgate, his unacknowledged "maister" for this part of the poem, James manages to make the account of Venus's temple clearly relevant to that part of his "aventure" related in the earlier part of the poem, amplifying the personal experience without submerging it in a mass of digressive detail.

Before looking at the critical use which James makes of The Temple of Glas, a short summary of Lydgate's poem will be made. The poet tells how he was transported in a dream to a "temple of glas", as he lay one December night,

Al desolate for constreint of my wo
The longe nyȝt waloing to and fro. (11-12)

The poem goes on to describe the temple itself, and the groups of unhappy lovers who make their complaints to Venus.

The beauty of one lady in particular is described, and there follow her complaint and the goddess's reply. This is paralleled, with a certain predictability, by the complaint of a fair knight who is the object of the lady's affections. Venus advises him to address the lady: he does this, is favourably received, and the lovers are joined by Venus in an eternal bond of love. (The possibility of fulfilment, however, remains rather remote.) The company in the temple sings the praise of the goddess of love, awakening the narrator who declares that he will make a "litel tretise" for the lady of his dream. The poem is really little more than a sequence of set-pieces, and the first person framework is merely a formal unifying device, somehow extraneous to the matter of the poem. In the epilogue Lydgate does attempt to recall the opening situation and to relate himself to the matter of his dream. The attempt does not succeed, not only because of the heavily stereotyped characterization of the poet as lover, but also because there is no sense within the body of the narrative of the narrator's presence as dreamer and beholder. Derek Pearsall's conjecture that Lydgate has not fully worked out his relationship to his persona⁶³ is well-justified.

In his handling of the description of the temple of Venus in the Quair, James succeeds where Lydgate fails, in making the substance of his vision both encyclopaedic and relevant to what has gone before. Lydgate is concerned to universalize by showing the many causes of unhappiness in love: the complainants in the temple suffer because of

"absence", slander, danger, disdain, poverty, and envy.

Groups of women complain because they have been forced into marriage against their will, or because they have been compelled to enter convents. Regrettably, the effectiveness of these two fairly specific kinds of grievance is dissipated by the continuation of the catalogue of general complaints. As elsewhere in Lydgate's poetry, the use of the catalogue device involves monotony and a progressive deterioration of meaning. Lydgate's company of "mani a thousand of louers" is introduced by a lengthy list of the names of famous lovers painted on the wall of the temple: this list suffers from the same fault as that which follows it. With a shrewd side glance at the prolixity of his model, James declines to name any of his "mony a mylioune",

Off guhois chancis made is mencioune
In diuerse bukis, quho thame list to se,
And therefore here thaire namys lat I be. (st.78, 5-7)

The rambling account in The Temple of Glas of the various kinds of complainants is carefully reduced and structured in the Quair. Where Lydgate has a catalogue of multiple causes for complaint against Venus, James makes a two-fold division of "loves folk": on the one side of a "tre vess" or curtain there are those who have won a measure of immortality through their true service to love. These are divided into three "stages": on the highest one are the old people who have served Venus truly all their lives, then come the young folk who show true "curage", and on the lowest stage are those lovers who are clerics visited by Repentance. On the other side of the division are those who have not had the opportunity to love, and here James introduces the two most inter-

esting groups of unfortunates in The Temple of Glas, those who have been forced into religious houses or into unwanted marriages. In the Quair the description of the inhabitants of the temple is carefully ordered: the architectural device of the "trevesse" contributes to this effect, and the explanation by the mysterious voice of what the various groups represent (sts.83-92) follows the order in which he beholds them. The structural technique of the episode seems to be modelled on Chaucer's method in Book III of The Hous of Fame, where those who have won fame are situated on pillars of different kinds, while the supplicants are separated from them and divided into several groups. Unlike Lydgate, James makes his persona an actor as well as a beholder in the temple of Venus: the voice addresses him directly. The episode is made relevant to the situation of the "I" in two ways: first, the point that a desire to serve Venus is not always accompanied by good fortune is made (recalling the earlier references to fortune), and beyond this, there is the clear suggestion that the poet is to be regarded as one who will occupy a position on the highest "stage" of love, with the "agit folk" who have given true and life-long service. (The scene is recalled later, when Venus promises him that if he and his lady are faithful to her, they will live with her forever more "as goddis in this place"). The strong retrospective effect of the poem - Maturity reviewing Youth - implies that the poet is no longer in his first youth when he addresses his audience,⁶⁴ and hence there is an implied affinity between the narrator and those who occupy the privileged place of the highest stage,

.. agit folk with hedis hore and olde,
 3one were the folk that neuer change wold
 In lufe, bot trewly seruit him alway, (st.83, 4-6)

which is absent in the original of the description. Also relevant to the situation of the poet is the fact that poets, specifically those who extol the virtue "of lufe in thaire suete layes", are included in this honoured company of the first stage (85). This is, of course, another of James's particularizing additions to the list in The Temple of Glas.

The other passage of amplifying description - the account of the "lusty plane" which is the dominion of Fortune (152-7) - is a skilful and inventive adaptation of two Chaucerian passages which also have the quality of paysage moralisé. The first of these is the description of the well-ordered dream garden in The Book of the Duchess (416-20; 427-33); the second, the account of the garden in which Venus and Nature dwell in The Parlement of Foules. There is a verbal parallel between part of the Quair passage and that in the Parlement, sufficiently close to be worthy of mention:

That full of lytill fischis by the brym,

 Thaire curall fynnis as the ruby rede,
 That in the sonne, on thair scalis bryght,
 As gesserant ay glitterit in my sight. (KQ, st.153)

And colde welle-stremes, nothyng dede,
 That swymmen ful of smale fishes lighte,
 With fynnes rede and skales sylver bryghte. (PF, 187-9)

Like Chaucer, James employs the catalogue form to emphasize the sense of ordered variety and plenitude in the scene. The difference is, as John MacQueen points out,⁶⁵ that whereas Chaucer describes the realm of Nature, James associates Nature with Fortune. In The Book of the Duchess, there

is an implicit opposition between Fortune and Nature: the suffering knight turns his back on the world of ordered Nature to bewail the cruelty of Fortune in depriving him of his lady. Similarly, in the Parlement, different attributes are given to the two goddesses who inhabit the same garden: "the gift of Nature appears to be fruitful and happy, as opposed to unsuccessful and miserable, love, which last is controlled by Venus".⁶⁶ In the Quair there is a striking reconciliation of Fortune, Nature and Venus. Fortune fulfils the role of Chaucer's beneficent goddess Nature, at the centre of an ordered creation, the agent of the divine Reason. The poet is guided into the land of Fortune - i.e., the world - after he has been instructed on the related themes of endurance in love, self-knowledge, and an understanding of Fortune, by Venus and Minerva. The descent "doune to ground ageyne" is the logical outcome of the advice which is given by the two goddesses who act in concert with Fortune, and the descriptive passage thus becomes a striking way of articulating the poet's philosophy. James draws on the Chaucerian passages to imply a contrast in context between them and his own description. Chaucer's poems are concerned with discord and division, and no reconciliations are suggested. In the Quair, on the other hand, the poet chooses to express an optimistic and synthetic view of love and destiny. In his captivity (which is both literal and metaphorical), the poet laments his isolation from the free harmony of "The bird, the beste, the fisch eke in the see", and this return to the world is presented in terms of an imminent re-union, through the intercession of Fortune,

with the rest of ordered Creation. The poet's concern for structural coherence and his interest in detail are both illustrated by the boundaries of the dream journey: the dream has begun, in misery, when the poet is confined within a tower, and it comes to an end with the promise of happiness when he visits another "round place and a wallit".

Lydgate's translation of Deguile ville's Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine⁶⁷ is another English work which plays some part in James's handling of the Boethian theme of Fortune. The use which is made of Lydgate-Deguileville is discussed by MacQueen⁶⁸ and McDiarmid,⁶⁹ to whose comments I have little to add. The idea of circularity - of man's desire to liberate himself from the troubled sea of worldly "misfortune" and to return to his proper place in the divinely-appointed harmony - is central to both poems, but the view of Fortune which is reached in the Quair is fundamentally different from the view of Lydgate-Deguileville, just as it is different from the attitude to Fortune expressed in the two Chaucerian dream-visions discussed above. In the Pilgrimage, Grace Dieu intervenes to guide the Pilgrim from Fortune, and although (as in the Quair) Fortune's power is not absolute, it is rigidly excluded from any lawful place in the divine order of the world. It is obvious of course that in the Quair Fortune occupies a very different position, signified by the conflation of the goddess of mutability with Nature, and by the fact that her operations are shown to be in accord with the power "Of him that hiest in the hevin sitt". James's view is closer to that of Boethius, although the

emphasis on the potentialities of human love marks a distinctive adaptation of the Boethian view.

The link with the Pilgrimage provides an interesting illustration of the subtle and allusive use which James makes of his reading of English poetry. It involves the associations of the dove which brings to the newly-awakened lover a branch bearing a message:

"Awak! awake! I bring, lufar, I bring
The newis glad that blisfull bene and sure
Of thy confort. Now lauch, and play, and syng,
That art besid so glad ane auenture,
For in the hevyn decretit is the cure." (st.179, 1-5)

As MacQueen points out,⁷⁰ the motif has a clear connection with the lines in the Pilgrimage which describe the means of the Pilgrim's escape from Fortune:

And whyl I lay thus compleynyng,
And knewh non helpe nor respyt,
A-noon ther kam A dowe whyht
Towardys me, by goddys wylle,
And brouhte me a lytel bylle,
And vndyde yt in my syht... (19726-31)

"In both poems .. the dove has much the same significance, that of grace, and particularly theological grace".⁷¹

McDiarmid agrees that the dove represents Grace, "with its gift of faithful love", but finds the episode unsatisfactory because the poet makes it try to say too much.⁷² There is the further objection that it is difficult to relate the first-person address to any speaker or writer.⁷³ Neither criticism is, in my view, valid. The dove is the messenger not only of divine grace, but also of Venus: the passage in the Quair immediately recalls Chaucer's description of the temple of Venus in the Parlement - "And on the temple, of dowves white and fayre/ Saw I syttyng many an hundred

peyre" (237-8). The speaker of the message is clearly Venus: the exhortation to "lauch, and play, and syng" is a repetition of what she has earlier told the poet about the way in which she is to be obeyed. By drawing on his reading to give the dove the associations of both Love and Divine Grace, James leaves no doubt about the quality of his love: to use the words of Minerva, desire is to be "ground and set in Cristin wise". Provided that we recognize the full implications of the message, there can be no justification for the charge that the poet tries to fit too much into the episode.

Literary allusion, again involving reference to a bird, enriches the meaning of an earlier episode in the Quair, the prisoner's distress because the nightingale outside his window apparently refuses to sing to make "chere" for the lady who is in the courtyard below. He implores the bird,

O lytill wrecche, allace, maist thou nought se
 Quho commyth zond? Is it now tyme to wring?
 Quhat sory thought is fallin vpon the?
 Opyn thy throte. Hastow no lest to sing? (st.57, 1-4)

and concludes with the challenge that if she refuses his request,

.. wostow than sum bird may cum and stryve
 In song with the, the maistry to purchace?
 Suld thou then cesse? It were grete schame, allace.
 (st.59, 3-5)

The "sum bird", unidentified in the Quair, is almost certainly the cuckoo, and the allusion is to The Cuckoo and the Nightingale.⁷⁴ The narrator in Clanvowe's poem tells how, among lovers,

it was a comune tale,
 That it were good to here the nightingale
 Rather than the lewde cukkoo singe. (48-50)

When he (a lover himself) hears the song of the cuckoo, he calls out to the nightingale, in much the same way that the prisoner in the Quair does,

"A! goode Nightingale," quod I thenne,
 "A litel hast thou been to longe henne;
 For here hath been the lewede Cukkow,
 And songen songes rather than hast thou." (101-4)

The song of the cuckoo, as the ensuing bird dialogue makes clear, is a song in condemnation of love. The narrator's anxious hope that the nightingale should have "maistry", and his close affinity with her, are strongly reminiscent of the situation in the Quair. The allusion to The Cuckoo and the Nightingale (of which there are several verbal echoes in the Quair) is vital to interpretation of the scene. If the cuckoo were to come to sing first,⁷⁵ it is highly unlikely that the love-suit could prosper. As well as Clanvowe's destructive bird, it is worth recalling Chaucer's cuckoo, who is totally selfish and takes the view that others may be "soleyn al here lyve" (PF, 605-7). In the Quair the lover's plight is so desperate because the song of the bird is the only means by which he can "communicate" with the lady in the garden. Norton-Smith's comment on the passage,

James's unique attractiveness may be summed up in his indulgent concern about the nightingale's failure to sing and in his serious and irrelevant search for the reason..⁷⁶

shows a total disregard of the poet's subtle use of literary tradition. It should be obvious, too, that the reminiscence of The Cuckoo and the Nightingale gives the scene a deeper significance than that noted by McDiarmid - "anxiety lest the hope glimpsed in the girl should vanish".⁷⁷

In this chapter I have tried to show the great variety of ways in which the author of The Kingis Quair draws upon English poetry to enrich the style and the "moralitee" of his poem. The most considerable debt, it will be obvious, is to Chaucer, from whose poetry he has learned the all-important lessons of the value of a continuing sense of authorial presence in narrative, and of the effects which can be achieved through variation in narrative technique. Several of Chaucer's poems, together with a smaller number of works by Lydgate and other early fifteenth century English poets, constitute sources for the Quair, but it is important to recognize that James never slavishly copies the technique or subject matter of another poem. Borrowed poetic material is at all times subordinated to the logic of the poet's own argument, expressed in his own "tong", and frequently elements drawn from other poems are significantly altered to stress by contrast James's distinctive approach to the eternal themes of love and fortune. The originality of the Quair lies not only in its treatment of the life of a particular individual, but also in its unique combination and synthesis of an inherited genre and themes. The grace and ease with which James expresses a serious and universal philosophy make him better qualified than any of his English contemporaries to receive the kind of praise which William Webbe reserves for Chaucer:

who could with more delight prescribe such wholesome counsaile and sage aduise, where he seemeth onelie to respect the profite of his lessons and instructions? ... so that this is the very ground of right poetrie, to give profitable counsaile, yet so as it must be mingled with delight.⁷⁸

There is nothing self-conscious or awkward about the traditionalism of the Quair, and this argues both a high degree of technical expertise and a close knowledge of Middle English poetry. Some of the allusions are very subtle, and it is reasonable to assume that the audience for whom James wrote had some knowledge of the poems to which he refers. If this assumption is correct, the familiarity with English forms of poetic expression must be attributed in large part to a standard of taste established at the Scottish court by the king and his English queen.

Chapter III

The English affinities of The Testament of Cresseid.

"Thus endeth the fyfth and laste booke of Troylus: and here followeth The Pyteful and Dolorous Testament of Fayre Cresseyde": with this colophon William Thynne introduced The Testament of Cresseid to the English reading public in 1532.¹ That he intended readers to believe that the Scots poem was the work of Chaucer is reasonably certain, since The Testament of Cresseid is placed between Troilus and Criseyde and The Legend of Good Women.² It is one of the most notable injustices of literary history that Henryson's poem continued to be attributed to Chaucer for the next two centuries. The Testament, more than any other Scots poem of the period, is the focal point of an interrelationship between English and Scots poetic traditions. Henryson's treatment of the Trojan love story is unmistakably original, but many of its most important effects cannot be fully appreciated unless the reader has the same close knowledge of Troilus and Criseyde that Henryson himself possessed. No one would deny Henryson's indebtedness to Chaucer, but the precise nature of the debt - shown in a continuity of moral emphasis, and an inventive use of certain Chaucerian techniques - has not been argued with sufficient vigour. Most of this chapter is devoted to considering Henryson's use of Troilus and Criseyde as background for his own poem, but some attention will be given to the aspect of the Testament's relationship to English literature which is less frequently discussed by recent critics. This is the influence which Henryson's handling of his heroine had upon sixteenth century references to her, and ultimately upon Shakespeare's handling of the story in Troilus and Cressida.

In the previous chapter I have shown how in The Kingis Quair the form and phraseology of a group of stanzas from Troilus and Criseyde are carefully reworked, and how the effect is to suggest the distance between the points of view of the two poets: Chaucer will go no further than to express a sympathetic interest in the concerns of lovers, but James is impatient with such caution - the experience is all.³ It is impossible to tell whether James's allusion to Chaucer's poem to enrich the style and meaning of his own had any effect on Henryson's decision to write a work which, to an even greater extent than the Quair, would invite comparison with Troilus and Criseyde. Since Henryson does seem to have been familiar with the Quair there is at least a likelihood that the earlier poem had some bearing upon the composition of his own "poet's poem". Although Henryson is further removed in time than James from Chaucer's poetry, both the Testament and the Quair manifest a strong sense of professional camaraderie towards Chaucer. So much at ease with Chaucer's poetry is Henryson that he dares to cast doubt upon the English poet's handling of the classical story as a way of introducing his own: the ironic question "Quha wait gif all that Chauceir wrait was trew?" is a landmark among his contemporaries' fulsome and repetitive expressions of their inferiority to the master of poets. (James is not so explicit about questioning Chaucer, but his handling of the prayer for lovers produces the same kind of effect as the later poet's question.) Denton Fox writes that the Testament is "about Chaucer's poem, in the sense that a critical essay is about a piece of literature", and that the poem "offers a

remarkably accurate and penetrating analysis of Troilus".⁴ I shall attempt to show why I consider that the Testament is about Troilus and Criseyde: while Fox's general assessment is unexceptionable, my own interpretation of both poems differs materially from his. The following discussion is divided, for the sake of clarity, into five main sections, which are obviously closely interrelated: character and thematic emphasis; religion; the role of Fortune; the role of the narrator; motifs, language, and versification.

It is quite clear that Henryson was able to assume a good knowledge of Troilus and Criseyde on the part of his audience. The casual "quha will luik" (60) suggests that there was no problem of availability: it is likely that the poem was written several years after the issue of Caxton's Troilus in about 1483. And of course Chaucer's poem is among the contents of The Kingis Quair MS.⁵ Henryson provides a brief resumé of part of Chaucer's final Book - Criseyde's reception by Diomedes, Troilus's hope which rapidly gives way to despair and grief (43-56) - relying on his audience to know the preceding action. More important perhaps, he relies on their ability to recognize a major departure from Chaucer's narrative. Troilus's discovery of Criseyde's infidelity, his death and ascent to the heavens are ignored, and Henryson turns, through the device of the "uther quair", to the subject of Criseyde's life among the Greeks, taking up from where Chaucer had left off. Troilus, in Chaucer's poem, is unquestionably the dominant figure: the "double sorwe" about which the poem is structured centres

upon his experience of love, and most of Book V is devoted to an account of his torment. Troilus's idealism, his "worthinesse", is emphasized throughout, and he is clearly much less culpable than Criseyde. There is a development from scornful disregard of Love to a willing subjection to its promptings, attainment of its supreme felicity giving way to an anguish which culminates in the knowledge of his beloved's perfidy: after death, this bitter knowledge is replaced by recognition of what natural love means sub specie aeternitatis. From the point of view of moral development, Criseyde is a much more static figure, since from beginning to end her behaviour is regulated to a considerable extent by her timidity and the consequent need for protection and security. Henryson's point of departure is to show his heroine undergoing change, coming to recognize, as Chaucer's hero does, the meaning and the errors of the past. As we see her at the beginning of the Testament she is recognizable as the lady of Troilus and Criseyde, "a very good guess at what Chaucer's Criseyde might have become after she had passed through the hands of Diomedes and others, and grown older, harder, and more unhappy".⁶ The distance between Cresseid and the heroine of Chaucer's poem, cast out by Diomedes and others, returning in disguise to her father's protection, is an introduction to Henryson's major theme, one which obviously depends for its effect on a knowledge of Chaucer's heroine. The story of Cresseid as it is told by Henryson is the argumentum through which he presents a moral theme, the destructive and painful consequences which ensue from untruth in love. Cresseid, like Chaucer's Troilus,

undergoes a "double sorwe": the first is the experience of being forsaken, which corresponds to Troilus's second sorrow, the second is the sorrow which comes with retribution.

The Testament of Cresseid has a lesson to teach, although Henryson does not cast it into the form of a moralitas as he does in Orpheus and Eurydice and the Morall Fabillis. In the concluding stanza, the poet addresses his audience,

Now, worthie Wemen, in this Ballet schort,
Made for your worschip and Instructioun,
Of Cheritie, I monische and exhort,
Ming not your lufe with fals deceptioun.
Beir in your mynd this schort conclusioun
Of fair Cresseid, as I have said befoir.
Sen scho is deid, I speik of hir no moir.

This complements the moving speech in which Cresseid proclaims her function as an example and a warning to others,

Lovers be war and tak gude heid about
Quhome that ye lufe, for quhome ye suffer paine.
I lat yow wit, thair is richt few thairout
Quhome ye may traist to have trew lufe agane. (561-4)

Becaus I knaw the greit unstabilnes
Brukill as glas, into my self I say,
Traisting in uther als greit unfaithfulnes:
Als unconstant, and als untrew of fay.
Thocht sum be trew, I wait richt few ar thay,
Quha findis treuth lat him his Lady ruse.. (568-73)

With new self-knowledge, Cresseid generalizes from her own experience ("into my self I say"), stating that many other women are as unfaithful as she has been. It is important to recognize the thematic continuity between the Testament and Troilus and Criseyde, since it reflects an affinity of temper and moral outlook between the two poets. In Fox's view, Henryson follows Chaucer inasmuch as his poem, like Chaucer's, emphasizes "the vanity of sexual love", its illusory nature

and inevitably bitter end.⁷ Sexual love in Henryson's poem is of course shown to be mutable, simply because mutability is a condition of human life: the imagery of the seasons and of natural growth expresses this idea quite clearly.⁸ But by reading the poem as an outright condemnation of love, Fox pays scant heed to the meaning of the passages quoted above. The distinction between "trew" and "fals" in love is heavily emphasized at the end of the poem, and Cresseid dies torn by the memory of her abuse of Troilus's "trew lufe" (591). The view which emerges from the Testament is that deception in love, because it is essentially self-deception, leads to pain and self-destruction. Truth in love is comparatively rare ("thair is richt few thairout/ Quhome ye may traist to have trew lufe agane"), and for this very reason is to be cherished and preserved when it occurs. Bennett debases Cresseid's meaning by reading this line as "Take them as you find them".⁹ To what extent, then, is Henryson echoing or developing a thematic concern of Troilus and Criseyde? In this connection it is necessary to recall what Chaucer himself has to say about the meaning of his poem in the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women, where he pleads in defence against the charge of heresy levelled at him by the God of Love,

Ne a trewe lover oght me not to blame,
 Thogh that I speke a fals love som shame.
 They oghte rather with me for to holde,
 For that I of Creseyde wroot or tolde,
 Or of the Rose; what so myn auctour mente,
 Algate, God woot, yt was myn entente
 To forthren trouthe in love and yt cheryce,
 And to ben war fro falsnesse and fro vice,
 By swich ensample; this was my menyng. (F, 466-74)

Troilus and Criseyde is a complex and ambiguous poem, and

one of its most perceptive critics has cautioned that "The thematic material... - the conception of love, the moral and philosophical content - is woven through, and is not detachable as a coherent, separate 'message'".¹⁰ Admittedly, Chaucer's presentation of sexual love amplifies the complexity of the subject through reference to divergent systems of thought, but there is no reason to believe that the poet is not being serious when he says, as a character in a later poem, that his intent was "To forthren trouthe in love and yt cheryce". Henryson's earnest address to "worthie Wemen" seems to have been modelled on Chaucer's plea that "every gentill womman" should understand that Criseyde's untruth is not universal (V, 1772-8). Chaucer attempts to extend the applicability of the message by implying that not all men are as true as Troilus: "N'y sey nat this al oonly for thise men,/ But moost for wommen that bitraised be/ Thorough false folk" (V, 1779-85). The address to both sexes is implied also in the Testament: Cresseid speaks to "lovers" rather than simply to men when she advises caution in the choice of a partner. The only difference is in the comparative awkwardness and self-consciousness of Chaucer's transition from addressing one sex to addressing the other.

Troilus and Criseyde does not represent an ascetic view of life, one which encourages the avoidance of sexual love. Henryson, more perceptive than some of his critics, recognizes that Chaucer's "menynge" is rather to encourage honesty, and this is mirrored in his continuation of the story. The Testament, like Troilus and Criseyde, does not confuse

transience with illusion: love, like life itself, cannot endure forever, but it is not to be shunned for this reason. Cresseid's blasphemy reflects her mistaken belief that her beauty, her ability to love and her capacity for attraction, are ordained to flower forever - "Ye gave me anis ane devine responsaill/ That I suld be the flour of luif in Troy", she complains to Cupid and Venus (127-8). Her conception of love is illusory, because self-delusive, and too late she recognizes her fault in abusing the true love of Troilus. What is condemned is not the sexual love itself, but the deception made manifest by Cresseid's "leving unclene and Lecherous". In Chaucer's narrative, both lovers are deceived in their belief that sexual love is the dominant controlling force in life: for example, Troilus vows to Criseyde that she has been divinely appointed to be his "steere", to decide whether he is to live or to die (III, 1289-92). There is ample indication from the beginning of the poem - in authorial comment and in the speeches of the characters themselves - that the Trojan lovers elevate physical and emotional experience to a position inadmissible in either Christian or Platonic-Stoic philosophy.¹¹ It is important, if we are to understand Troilus and Criseyde and Henryson's appreciation of it, to recognize that what is condemned at the end of Chaucer's poem is not sexual love itself but a complete and single-minded devotion to it - "The blynde lust, the which that may nat laste" (V, 1824). The value of love is expressed in the very image which evokes its transience ("This world, that passeth soone as floures faire") and there is also recognition of its naturalness ("In which that love

up groweth with youre age").¹²

One of the most striking differences in Henryson's treatment of the themes of self-deception and unfaithfulness is his avoidance of Chaucer's explicitly Christian framework of reference. At the end of his story Chaucer quite consciously underlines its pastness, its remoteness from the Christian dispensation under which he and his audience live - "Lo here, of payens corsed olde rites". The final standpoint is at marked variance with the attempt throughout the poem to secure a high degree of audience involvement in the story, and the effect of the emphatically Christian conclusion is to suggest that the Christian must use his free will to ensure that his emotional conduct is within the bounds prescribed by Divine Law. Laying the heart "al holly" on Christ, and setting "al oure herte on heven" does not exclude sexual experience grounded on truth, providing that the human love does not take precedence over the spiritual. The ending brings into sharp focus the references to God which punctuate the poem, compelling the reader to observe their ambivalence. Thus the "Love" and "God" of the first proem refer to both Cupid and the Christian God, and the God who "loveth, and to love wol nought werne" (III, 12) is both the binding force of pagan cosmology and the God of Aquinas. Chaucer relies here on the standard medieval interpretation of the gods, inviting his audience to recognize that the powers of the Trinity encompass - "circumscribe" - the functions of those deities addressed by courtly love poets and Platonic philosophers. He uses Christianity, the courtly

love code, and the Boethian system as perspectives on the narrative, and ultimately the reader is left to make the necessary reconciliations and syntheses, with the knowledge that Christianity is the Truth. Courtly love as a code of behaviour is not condemned - presumably because its aim is to encourage a truthful and faithful relation between the sexes - but it is clearly subordinate to the Love of God.

Whereas Chaucer comes to view transient worldly experience from the standpoint of the eternal verities of Christian revelation, Henryson's focus is constantly upon human conduct in this life. The Scots poet shares his predecessor's concern for integrity in the conduct of sexual affairs, but the way in which this theme is treated differs from Chaucer's. There is no explicit reference to the Christian God at all. Cresseid blasphemes against Venus and Cupid, the gods who regulate sexual affairs. What Henryson understands by love is made quite clear by the symbolic action of the parliament dream-vision: Cupid summons the seven planets, "participant of devyne sapience", requesting that they take action to correct an injury which has been done to them as well as to himself (292-3). The planet gods and their interrelations signify, as MacQueen so clearly explains, "one aspect of the moral, but also.. the physical law of the universe, a law which is most clearly expressed for the twentieth century reader by such terms as time and change, growth and decay".¹³ Love is hence not conceived as amour courtois (although some of the conventions of courtly love are used), but as love in its much more general application to "all thing

generabill". By paying insufficient attention to the telling link between Cupid and the forces of time and change, some critics have taken the view that Cresseid's behaviour must be judged in terms of courtly morality.¹⁴ Henryson sees human love in considerably wider and more universally relevant terms, although like Chaucer he applauds Troilus's constancy in terms of the courtly standard (554-60).

Cresseid's sin is two-fold: a rejection of Troilus's faithful love, and a presumption that it is natural to exchange one partner for another as circumstances decree. It is not primarily against the love deity (because of the context in which Henryson places Cupid), but against Nature, the laws that regulate human behaviour. Nor is her sin treated as one specifically against the Christian God: her presumption is of course a sin "against God's holy laws", as Tillyard suggests,¹⁵ but the planet symbolism compels us to see it primarily as a sin against Nature. It is according to the laws of Nature that she is punished. The punishment is unpleasant, as the vivid descriptions of Cresseid's diseased appearance testify, but it is also eminently natural. Henryson emphasizes this by his ironic (because so obviously contradictory) appeal for mercy,

O cruell Saturne! fraward and angrie,
Hard is thy dome, and to malitious...

Withdraw thy sentence and be gracious
As thou was never..

(323-8)

Time, clearly enough, is by its very nature unmerciful.

Cresseid's transformation is ugly, but it is the logical outcome of her ugly abuse of her sexuality: as MacQueen¹⁶ and Fox¹⁷ point out, leprosy ~~was synonymous~~ with

venereal disease.

The sombreness of some of the planet-gods who pronounce sentence so summarily on Cresseid, and the distressing nature of the punishment, have led to some critical misunderstanding of Henryson's moral outlook. In a stimulating article on the conciseness of Henryson's style, A.C. Spearing suggests that the poem raises disturbing questions about the presence of justice in the universe. Cresseid is seen as the victim of the "overwhelming" power of forces beyond her control, forces which epitomize "the threatening, the destructive, the malicious".¹⁸ It is necessary for this view that the planet-gods and Cresseid's disease be regarded as essentially non-symbolic. The reasons given for regarding Jupiter and Mercury as sinister forces are not convincing,¹⁹ and it is excessively literal-minded to dissent from the view that Cresseid's leprosy is a venereal disease on the grounds that there are no symptoms before she curses Cupid.²⁰ surely her cry that the "seid of lufe.. with froist is slane" betokens an awareness that she has become repulsive, even to herself. Failure to recognize fully the implications of Henryson's symbolism underlies Douglas Duncan's view that in the Testament Henryson "questions the divine order quite peremptorily".²¹ Tatyana Moran's emphasis is rather different, in that she sees cruelty not as a universal force, but as the distinguishing feature of Henryson's attitude to women.²² This criticism, which begs the question of Cresseid's regeneration in blaming only herself, might with more justice have been applied to the Manichaeistic outpourings of

Bishop John Longland: e.g.,

Serpentes shall enheryte thy bodye as thou doest naturally thy fadre his landes. Euen so serpentes wormes and toodes shall gnaw, eate and deuoure thy beawtyfull face, thy fayre nose, thy clere eyes, thy whyte handes, thy gudly bodye.²³

The language of this part of the sermon, given in 1536 (four years after the publication of Thynne's Chaucer) is close enough to that of the Testament, 577-8, to suggest that Longland had read Henryson's poem.

What distinguishes the Testament from Troilus and Criseyde is not questioning of God's justice versus affirmation of it, but rather Henryson's un-Chaucerian willingness to concentrate attention on the unpleasant consequences of wilful and concupiscent behaviour. This insistence on the facts of temporal experience is the ground for the kind of tropological reading which MacQueen so persuasively advocates: the story of Cresseid as an instance of the painful consequences of the divorce of Appetite from Moral Virtue.²⁴ In her final meeting with Troilus, Cresseid remembers all that he represents, and this recalls the parting scene in Troilus and Criseyde, where Chaucer's heroine declares the ground of her affection for Troilus - "moral vertue, grounded upon trouthe" (IV, 1672). In the moralitas of Orpheus and Eurydice, the characteristics of Appetite ("effectioun") are described:

Quhile to ressonne it castis the delyte,
Quhyle to the flesche it settis the appetyte. (433-4)

What Cresseid recognizes before her death is that she has misused appetite by loosening the bond with Moral Virtue, a bond in which sexual love was controlled by intellect and

reason. No similar kind of allegorical reading of Troilus and Criseyde is possible, partly because it is a much more diffuse poem than the Testament, partly because of Chaucer's removal of his hero to a vantage point from which he is able to laugh at the whole of human life: the clear implication is that Troilus has placed too high an evaluation upon a transitory good,²⁵ and for this reason the temptation to identify Chaucer's Troilus with an ideal of moral behaviour is checked. In depicting the moral regeneration of his heroine - the recognition that she has been in error - Henryson makes a significant departure from his model. At the end of his poem Chaucer quite deliberately alienates his audience's sympathy for Troilus: the hero's death is not dwelt upon, and his recognition of the nature of earthly love is the kind that can only come after death. It is rather difficult to extend sympathy and compassion to a figure who rejects them by his laughter. Fox argues that Henryson's Cresseid "goes through precisely the same cycle" (i.e., as Chaucer's Troilus does), of "abandonment, suffering, death, wisdom, and salvation."²⁶ Surely, though, it is quite obvious that wisdom for Cresseid comes before her death, not after it. The effect of this radical change of emphasis, illustrated by Cresseid's "Nane but my self as now I will accuse" (574), is to give her a moral stature and a capacity for attracting our sympathy which she has never had in Troilus and Criseyde, and which even Chaucer's Troilus does not achieve. Henryson's failure to translate his heroine literally to a supra-worldly vantage point strongly suggests that he intended a comparison with Chaucer's treat-

ment of Troilus. When this comparison is made, we see that Henryson's faith in the potential of the human spirit to recognize the extent of its past error has no counterpart in Chaucer's poem. The view that compared with Chaucer, Henryson is a harsh and even vindictive moralist²⁷ is a long way from the truth.

The question of salvation for Cresseid is largely irrelevant to the interpretation of the poem, although Henryson does hint strongly that she is to be granted an after-life in the bequeathing of her spirit to Diana. This act, it may be noted, should not be interpreted as a condemnation of sexual love. The value which Cresseid endorses at her death is the kind of chastity in love which is adhered to by Troilus, "Honest and chaist in conuersatioun". Cresseid's vow has its counterpart in Troilus's ascent "to the holughnesse of the eighthe spere", since it indicates a growth of spirit beyond the confines of blind sexuality. It is tempting to believe that the much more subdued treatment of Cresseid's fate after death reflects some criticism on Henryson's part of Chaucer's heavily theatrical method of bridging the gap between the conclusion of Troilus's story and the Christian exhortation to his audience.²⁸ The fact that Henryson does not proceed, as Chaucer does, to place his exemplum of the necessity for truth in love within an insistently Christian framework of reference, is the most significant indication of his independent artistic vision. The Testament is far from being an unChristian poem: the truth is that Henryson has sufficient confidence in his

audience's powers of understanding to depend on them to recognize that the temporal laws which Cresseid abuses are part of the divinely ordained scheme which, just as it has punished a false lover's sin through pain and death, will sanction the existence of human love which is conducted in the knowledge that it cannot endure forever.

The idea of Fortune's controlling power over human affairs, whether as blind fate or as agent of divine providence, is so common in late medieval literature that it would be rash to suggest that Henryson borrowed it from Troilus and Criseyde. There are clear indications, though, that certain aspects of Chaucer's treatment of the theme of Fortune impressed Henryson sufficiently for him to incorporate them into the Testament. The most noteworthy instance of Henryson's appreciation of Chaucer's complex treatment of Fortune is his reworking of these lines in the Prologue to Book IV, which is ostensibly an account of the goddess's fickleness:

From Troilus she gan hire brighte face
Awey to writhe, and tok of hym non heede,
But caste hym clene out of his lady grace,
And on hire whiel she sette up Diomedé. (8-11)

There is, however, an identification between Criseyde and Fortune, suggested by the image of the "brighte face", and by the beginning of the following stanza:

For how Criseyde Troilus forsook,
Or at the leeste, how she was unkynde,
Moot hennesforth ben matere of my book.. (15-17)

The implication of this passage, like that of most of the other references to Fortune, is that Fortune exists only as a way of describing the consequences of the operation of

free will. Henryson develops Chaucer's identification of the human character with the female deity through his description of the goddess Venus. The attribution to Venus of two faces,

Under smyling scho was dissimulait,
Provocative, with blenkis Amorous,
And suddanelly changit and alterait,
Angrie as ony Serpent vennemous
Richt pungitive, with wordis odious.
Thus variant scho was, quha list tak keip,
With ane Eye lauch, and with the uther weip, (225-31)

associates her firmly with that other "vnstabill" goddess, Fortune.²⁹ There is also an implicit identification here between Venus-Fortune and Cresseid, whose eyes have also shot forth "blenkis Amorous", and who has changed, becoming "Richt pungitive" in her act of blasphemy. Cresseid, of course has two faces, one fair and the other painfully disfigured, and there is the sharp irony that, unlike Venus, she does not have the power to change her "bitter and sour" countenance at her own will. It is worth remembering, too, that medieval art sometimes portrayed Fortune as a harlot in the court:³⁰ there is an obvious parallel with the woman who wanders "into the Court commoun". E. Duncan Aswell makes the valuable point that Cresseid's enlightenment brings the recognition that by her selfish sexuality she has tried to ape the natural behaviour of the goddess:

Not only does she accept full responsibility for the position she has assumed on Fortune's wheel, as the active verb "clam" shows, but her use of "fickill" to describe both the wheel and her own faith and love suggests that she associates her own actions with Fortune.³¹

Our appreciation of the ironies inherent in Henryson's conflation of Cresseid with Venus-Fortune is further enriched when we recognize that the idea has been developed from a

Chaucerian irony. This is not the place for a detailed examination of the references to Fortune in Troilus and Criseyde.³² It is sufficient to point out that the allusions to Fortune's power in the Testament, like those in Chaucer's poem, are ironical, in that they suggest that events are determined by free will rather than by fate or chance. Other instances of Henryson's reference to Fortune may be considered in relation to his self-characterization as narrator.

The narrative pose which Henryson adopts in the Testament is carefully developed to complement the implied moralitas about the need for honesty in love. The tone of the narrator is often ironic in the same way that Chaucer's voice is in Troilus and Criseyde, and the similarity shows the extent of Henryson's sensitivity to the nuances of Chaucer's style. There are, however, two important differences in Henryson's self-characterization; unlike Chaucer, he depicts himself as an old man, one who has in his time been the servant of Venus. These distinguishing features of Henryson's "I" have important implications for interpretation of the Testament, and perhaps too for determining Henryson's attitude towards Chaucer's relationship to his subject matter.

The well-known sententia with which the Testament opens is a variant of Chaucer's maxim about the decorum which should govern a teller's relation to his tale:

For wel sit it, the sothe for to seyne,
 A woful wight to han a drery feere,
 And to a sorful tale, a sory chere. (12-14)

Henryson, as he presents himself in the Testament, is a very appropriate "feere" for both his central character and his audience, and the place which he holds in the narrative may be interpreted in two related ways. The first of these concerns our understanding of Cresseid and her error: the opening lines are an invitation to observe the extent of "correspondence" and "equivalence" between present and past, and the very conciseness of the poem is an inducement to examine the author's self-portrait for what it has to say about his subject matter. The figure who is prevented by the cold (both external and internal) from praying to Venus³³ is clearly associated with the character whose story he is about to tell. Like Cresseid, the narrator goes to an "oratur" in order to address the love deity: the awareness that the physical facts of existence make it impossible to associate himself with Venus, which leads him to embark upon a more natural occupation, is in marked contrast with Cresseid's attitude when she goes to pray. She blames the God of Love, and by extension Nature itself, because she is unable to recognize the sober truths of mutability. Her inability to continue in love is not, however, the result of age, but of her own degeneracy. The link between heroine and narrator is underlined by the metaphors of flowering and fading which are applied to both, in the context of the "doolie sessoun" in which the narrative is set.³⁴ Henryson implicitly compares himself not only with Cresseid, but also with Troilus, relying again on his audience's familiarity

with Troilus and Criseyde. Throughout his poem Chaucer demonstrates the fervour of his hero's affection, and Henryson's lines,

Thocht lufe be hait, yit in ane man of age
It kendillis nocht sa sone as in youtheid,
Of quhome the blude is flowing in and rage, (29-31)

draw a parallel between the different operations of Nature in age and youth. There is no disapproval implied here of the urgency of those feelings which Troilus experiences, and this is in accordance with the attitude to love which emerges later in the poem. It may be useful to quote at this point some lines from the sixteenth century poem "O man transformit and vnnaturall" (which Bannatyne attributes to one Weddirburne),³⁵ since they make explicit Henryson's sentiments about the naturalness of sexual love in youth:

Quhan zung men dois sic thing It is na schame
Becauss zowthheid garris thair blude flow & rege
bot auld menis Lust proceidis of daft dotage.. (75-7)

A secondary aspect of the thematic function of Henryson's self-portrait is that in it we are intended to see an example of how sexuality should be regulated according to the capacity of nature. Henryson does not bring any compulsion to bear on his audience in this respect - for example, he does not urge, as Cresseid does, "in your mynd ane mirrour mak of me" - but the invitation is nevertheless implied. It will be recalled that at the close of the Confessio Amantis Gower reveals himself as an old man, turning away from allegiance to Venus in order to undertake the study of "vertue moral". Like Gower, Henryson recognizes the necessity to curb the impulses of nature: more honest than Cresseid, he under-

stands that love cannot be obtained at will, and turns away to the pleasures of the fire, a book, and a drink. Again Weddirburne makes explicit the moral significance of Henryson's engaging personal aside in this exhortation to old men:

And sen thy blude Is becum cawld and dry
 And als thy flesche and banis consumys for eild
 Thairfoir thow sowld leif wantone chevalry
 Off venus warkis And to gif our þe feild
 And nevir to beir in amoris speir nor scheild
 Bot rathir at ane hett fyre the to hold
 Wt ane sydgoun to keip the fra þe cold
 Thow hes mair mistir of ane dowbill cap
 Nor of þe farest lady in to france
 Wt mittanis warme thy tendir handis to hap
 Nor for to se thy deir lufe sing or dance
 Restoratyvis be wyiss menis ordinance
 Wt sweit confectionis sowld be thy confort
 Rathir nor wt fresche ladeis for till sport. (78-91)

Weddirburne, it must be added, is a more doctrinaire moralist than Henryson: he urges that old men "sowld be to 3ung men gud exempill" by contemplating with "bukis and beidis" (41-2). In the Testament, the book which the narrator chooses to read is hardly the kind which needs to be followed with the aid of "bedis", but in its concern for issues temporal and eternal Troilus and Criseyde is just as serious as any devotional work.

We have already seen how in The Kingis Quair James implies some criticism of Chaucer's pose of withdrawal and detachment in Troilus and Criseyde. The Chaucerian narrator will come no nearer to the experiences described than to exclaim, in the account of the first night of love, "Why nad I swich oon with my soule ybought,/ Ye, or the leeste joie that was theere?" (III, 1319-20). It is reasonable to assume that by portraying himself as he does in the Testa-

ment, Henryson is following his royal predecessor in suggesting to his audience that a man who has experienced sexual love has greater authority to write about it than one who assumes a position of priestly remoteness. The narrator's past experience of love is not specifically discussed, but the allusion is sufficient for an audience to understand that he has a special competence to write a continuation of Chaucer's story. The Chaucerian withdrawal for which Henryson substitutes a pose of experience is of course not to be confused with the objective tendency of Chaucer's style in Troilus and Criseyde, which is marked by an extensive use of dialogue and description without authorial comment. Like Chaucer, Henryson is sufficiently confident to allow his story to "tell itself" with a minimum of explanation: the result, in both poems, is to give a special importance to passages in the first person.

Although Henryson distinguishes himself from Chaucer in the details of his self-representation, his comments on his heroine show a keen understanding of the ironical authorial commentary in Troilus and Criseyde. Like Chaucer, Henryson uses a technique of exposing moral fault through expressions of apparent sympathy and protectiveness. After the brief reference to Cresseid's expulsion from the "Court commoun", the narrator launches into what is ostensibly an exclamation of pity for Cresseid as the victim of malignant Fate:

O fair Cresseid, the flour and A per se
 Of Troy and Grece, how was thou fortunait!
 To change in filth all thy Feminitie,
 And be with fleschlie lust sa maculait,
 And go amang the Greikis air and lait

Sa giglotlike, takand thy foull plesance!
I have pietie thou suld fall sic mischance.

Yit nevertheless quhat ever men deme or say
In scornfull langage of thy brukkilnes,
I sall excuse, als far furth as I may,
Thy womanheid, thy wisdom and fairnes;
The quhilk Fortoun hes put to sic distres
As hir pleisit, and nathing throw the gilt
Of the, throw wickit langage to be spilt. (78-91;
my italics)

There is a complex dramatic irony at work in this passage: at the same time that the narrator appeals for sympathy for Cresseid as a passive victim, he conveys a strong sense of disgust at her wilful self-abuse. "Fortunait" in line 79 (which surely means "treated by Fortune" rather than Fox's more neutral "fated")³⁶ is made to alliterate with words that have overtones of moral judgement ("filth", "Feminitie", "fleschlie lust", "foull plesance") in the lines which follow.³⁷ They recall the lines in which Chaucer's heroine pleads the value of her "honeste" when Troilus proposes escape,

That floureth yet, how foule I sholde it shende,
And with what filthe it spotted sholde be,
If in this forme I sholde with yow wende. (IV, 1577-9)

It is no coincidence that Henryson repeats some of Chaucer's alliterating words ("flour", "foull", "filth"): recollection of Chaucer's lines is designed to heighten the significance of the passage in the Testament, since Chaucer's heroine sees "filth" as the outcome of an act of will on her part.³⁸ In the Testament, as in Troilus and Criseyde, it is the heroine, not Fortune, who transforms "feminitie" into "filth" by an act of choice. The credibility of Henryson's insistence on Fortune's responsibility for Cresseid's moral degeneration is undercut by the accompanying suggestion that

responsibility lies with her: as we read this passage, we suspect that his tone is ironical, and suspicion becomes certainty as the poem proceeds. Henryson's rhetorical strategy in these lines is that of showing us Cresseid's predicament at her own evaluation. When she sees for the first time the physical manifestations of her guilt, she blames Fortune, just as earlier she has blamed Venus and Cupid for her isolation:

Fell is thy Fortoun, wickit is thy weird:
Thy blys is baneist, and thy baill on breird.. (412-3)

Fortoun is fikkill, quhen scho beginnis & steiris. (469)

Before her death she comes to see that she, and not Fortune, has been "fikkill" (549-50) - "Nane but my self as now I will accuse" (574). This recognition is foreshadowed by the identification of Cresseid with Fortune in the description of Venus.³⁹

It is important to recognize that Henryson does not say that he will attempt to exonerate Cresseid: "excuse" in line 87 has rather the sense of "to defend", the sense in which Chaucer uses the word. The narrator says only that he will defend Cresseid's womanhood, fairness, and wisdom as far as he is able - "als far furth as I may", and this important limitation upon his ability to defend is itself a recognition of her guilt. Henryson's skilful assimilation of Chaucer's delicately ironical tone may be seen when we compare lines 85-91 of the Testament with some of Chaucer's comments upon Criseyde. At the beginning of Book IV of Troilus and Criseyde, for example, the narrator explains,

For how Criseyde Troilus forsook,
 Or at the leeste, how that she was unkynde,
 Moot hennesforth be matere of my book,
 As writen folk thorough which it is in mynde.
 Allas! that they sholde evere cause fynde
 To speke hire harm, and if they on hire lye,
 Iwis, hemself sholde han the vilanye. (15-21)

What may appear to be a plea on Criseyde's behalf is in fact an admission of her culpability. "Unkynde" means unnatural as well as inconsiderate, and the anticipation of her reputation in fiction (a shrewd one) points toward her fault rather than away from it. What Chaucer regrets is that there should ever have been cause to castigate his heroine: no attempt is made to conceal the fact that the cause exists. A similar kind of effect is created in these lines which follow the account of Criseyde's transfer of allegiance,

Ne me list this sely womman chyde
 Forther than the storrye wol devyse.
 Hire name, allas! is punysshed so wide,
 That for hire gilt it oughte ynough suffise.
 For she so sory was for hire untrouthe,
 Iwis, I wolde excuse hire yet for routhe. (V, 1093-9)

Like Henryson, Chaucer suggests only that he would like to defend Criseyde, not that he is actually doing so: "I wolde excuse hire" corresponds very closely to "als far furth as I may". It will be observed, too, that the Scots poet repeats Chaucer's ironic disclaimer of knowledge: compare "Men seyn - I not - that she yaf hym her herte" (TC, V, 1049), with "And sum men sayis into the Court commoun" (Test, 77). In both cases the effect is not to question, but rather to affirm the veracity of received opinion.

Ironical authorial commentary on the heroine in both poems produces the complex effect of both underlining the

moral fault and expressing pity for her. Like Chaucer, Henryson is a clear-sighted but by no means cold-blooded or vindictive moralist: there is pity for the woman because she is the victim not of cosmic injustice, but of her own cupidity. In the Testament, the combination of accusation and sympathy is apparent not only in the passage discussed above, but also in the address to "cruell Saturne" (323-9). The context establishes that Saturn is not in fact "to malitious", and that it is not in the nature of time to show mercy to anybody ("gracious/ As thou was never"). It would be difficult to deny Cresseid pity, but the line "Quhilk was sa sweit, gentill and amorous" is a reminder that sweetness and "gentillesse" were the attributes of the lady who gave her love to Troilus so long before, attributes which she clearly does not possess when she returns to her father after being expelled from the Greek court.

As narrator in the Testament, Henryson addresses his audience with urbane assurance, showing compassion for his central character, and at the same time relying on his audience to appreciate the irony of his tone. The method is strikingly similar to that of Chaucer in Troilus and Criseyde, although Henryson advances the distinctive authority of age and experience in love. Providing that we are prepared to accept that most forms of first person literary expression involve role-playing and variation of tone for the sake of emphasis, there can be no objection to identifying the "I" of the Testament with Henryson, and the "I" of Troilus and Criseyde with Chaucer. Spearing insists that

Henryson's participation in his poem is different in quality from that of Chaucer,⁴⁰ thereby showing an inadequate appreciation of the first person passages discussed above. There is certainly nothing single-minded and Troilus-like about Henryson's view of Cresseid.⁴¹ Fox's view of the narrator's characteristics and function in the Testament is even further wide of the mark. He suggests that the poet represents himself as a character, whose qualities are clearly distinguishable from those of his creator. This character is "an unintelligent, low-minded and disagreeable old man"... "an example of foolish and sinful attachment to sensuality",⁴² who is stupidly and passionately involved in the plight of his heroine.⁴³ This view is obviously derived from E. Talbot Donaldson's view of Chaucer as narrator, naïve and wildly emotional about Criseyde, refusing to accept the reality of her behaviour as it becomes increasingly obvious to the audience.⁴⁴ Fox, like Donaldson, mistakes what is essentially an ironic tone of voice for an attempt at large-scale characterization. The shortcomings of the approach are illustrated in Fox's comment that "When Cresseid begins to repent and to spurn earthly love she passes beyond the narrator's sympathy or comprehension".⁴⁵ The truth is rather that Henryson chooses to represent Cresseid's growth in awareness dramatically, mainly through direct speech, so that authorial intrusions are simply rendered unnecessary. Fox is unable to fit either the narrator's learned comment based on Aristotelian psychology (505-11) or the final admonitory stanza into his theory of characterization. Providing that we recognize that the

narrator's voice is predominantly serious from the beginning of the poem, the conclusion poses no problems of tonal disunity. Although the indebtedness is not acknowledged, C.W. Jentoft's appraisal of the narrator in the Testament is derived from Fox: he recognizes the affinity with the narrator of Troilus and Criseyde, and maintains that both are comic figures, carefully distanced from their creators.⁴⁶

The continuity between the Testament and Troilus and Criseyde is, as I have tried to show, sustained by Henryson's use of several demonstrably Chaucerian techniques (e.g., the presentation of the narrator, the ambivalent attitude to Fortune), and by the recollections of some of Chaucer's episodes and descriptions (e.g., Criseyde's prediction about the moral evil she could create through an act of will). There are in the Testament other examples of both kinds of Chaucerian reference which should be mentioned, although they are perhaps less significant than the instances I have discussed. Henryson shows himself to be a shrewd literary critic by his repetition of Chaucer's claim that he is bound to follow his source - "myn auctour called Lollius" (I, 394). Perhaps Chaucer did, by misunderstanding Horace's "Trojani belli scriptorum, maxime Lolli", assume that there was a Trojan historian called Lollius,⁴⁷ but for obvious reasons he could not have had the work before him as he wrote. Like any good medieval poet, Chaucer wanted his audience to believe that he wrote supported by the authority of "these olde wyse", but that he valued rhetorical advantage more than scrupulous scholarship is all too obvious in

his failure to name Boccaccio, the major source for Troilus and Criseyde. This is an elaborate literary joke, and Henryson shows his appreciation of it by repeating the "authority" topos in the Testament, in the allusion to the "uther quair" which he took up after reading the book written "be worthie Chaucer glorious". (It has been suggested that this mysterious other book might have existed, because of a reference to a "common" Cresseid in a prose treatise of 1492:⁴⁸ it seems much more likely, however, that the author of this had read Henryson's poem.)⁴⁹

Henryson's reference to the "uther quair" expresses more than his appreciation of the Chaucerian rhetorical trick, since it is by way of introducing a manifesto about the value of originality - "Inventioun" - to apply not only to his own work, but also to Chaucer's achievement. The device of taking up a book as a way of introducing an original poetic composition is also used by the author of The Kingis Quair,⁵⁰ and Henryson's use of it may well owe something to James's example.

Several references to Chaucer's poem serve to heighten the significance of important moments in Henryson's narrative. For example, his description of Cresseid's physical transformation recalls some of the details in Book IV of the "alteration" of Chaucer's heroine when she learns that she must leave Troy: her "sonnysshe heeris" are disarrayed (816), her eyes encircled by a "purpre ring" (869), her clear voice "broken.. al hoors forshright" (1147). Henryson intensifies the details of disfigurement (Testament, 337-9, 443-5), and

by recalling Chaucer's descriptions he underlines the extent of Cresseid's fall. In the Middle English poem, physical alteration is the "sothfast tokenyng of hire peyne" at leaving Troilus (870), but in the Testament the change betokens a serious moral disarray. A similar contrast between present and past is established by the stanza which describes how Troilus comes to remember the figure of Cresseid as he looks upon her in deformity:

The Idole of ane thing, in cace may be
Sa deip Imprentit in the fantasy
That it deludis the wittis outwardly.. (507-9)

The passage recalls Chaucer's account of the creation of the "Imprent" when Criseyde returns his gaze in the temple,

And of hire look in him ther gan to quyken
So gret desir and such affeccioun,
That in his hertes botme gan to stiken
Of hir his fixe and depe impressioun. (I, 295-8)

The flashback to the moment when the love affair began intensifies the pathos of a "recognition" scene in which neither of the participants is able to see the other. A more sharply ironic effect is generated in the Testament by the heroine's lament that Diomedes possesses the brooch which Troilus had given her "in takning/ Of his trew lufe" (589-91): she is not aware that Troilus already knows of her duplicity because he has seen the brooch on the armour captured from Diomedes (TC, V, 1660-6). This correspondence, like the others I have mentioned, assumes a good knowledge of Troilus and Criseyde on the part of the Scots audience.

B.J. Whiting draws attention to the parallel between Henryson's description of Saturn (155-68) and the account of

Saturn in The Assembly of Gods:⁵¹

But he was clad me thought straungely,
 For of frost & snow was all his aray;
 In his hand he helde a fawchon all blody.
 Hyt semyd by hys chere as he wold make a fray.
 A bawdryk of isykles about hys nek gay
 He had, and aboue an hygh on hys hede,
 Cowchyd with hayle stonys, he weryd a crowne of leede.
 (281-7)⁵²

The portrait in the Testament echoes the leaden aspect of the God, as well as the details of the icicles, the hailstones, and the spear, but Henryson expands Lydgate's description and alters its emphasis. There is nothing "gay" about the Scots Saturn: his association with Age is stressed by the sunken eyes (157), the running nose (158), the matted hair (163), and the clothes of grey (164), details which are absent from the Lydgatian poem. Henryson's most significant addition is the "flasche of felloun flanis,/ Fedderit with Ice" (167-8), conveying Saturn's anti-Cupid role, his function as Time which brings an end to love. There is nothing to suggest that Henryson revised any of the other planet portraits in the English poem. If the Lydgatian description of the planet-gods is a source for the parliament episode as a whole, it is clear that the complex pattern of interrelations within the portraits, which contributes so much to the allegorical statement, is the product of Henryson's invention. In the English poem the planet-gods are explicitly identified with the "ydollys" of the pagan dispensation (1674-1729).

Compared with The Kingis Quair, the Testament contains very few verbal borrowings from Troilus and Criseyde, or for

that matter from any other poem by Chaucer. Apart from the passages which are recalled for ironic effect, commented on above, the only borrowings of interest are the epithets used to describe the characters: Troilus, for example, is "worthie" (Testament, 42, 485: TC, I, 226; V, 1776, 1829) and Cresseid is "bricht of hewe" (Testament, 44: TC, IV, 663; V, 1573). The language of the Testament is thus very different from that of Lydgate's handling of the Troilus and Cressida story in the Troy Book: Lydgate's practice is to quote almost verbatim from Chaucer.⁵³ It is difficult to comment on Henryson's language accurately, since the surviving complete texts of the poem have been subject to sixteenth century modernization and (in the case of Thynne's print) to a degree of anglicization. Nevertheless, it is clear that his language and orthography are predominantly Scots rather than English, and there are instances of translation from Chaucerian English into Scots: for example, Chaucer's form "brotel" (TC, V, 1832) becomes "brukkill" in the Testament (569). The extent to which Henryson uses alliteration for emphasis (for example in the description of Saturn and in Cresseid's complaint) is not characteristic of Chaucer, and most of his alliterative vocabulary has no counterpart in the literary English of Chaucer or any of his fifteenth century English successors. What is most Chaucerian about Henryson's style is its ability to encompass, without apparent effort, a range of words from the learned to the colloquial, giving the overall effect of a form of heightened speech. Like Chaucer, he uses insistently rhetorical effects very sparingly: in both poems, for

example, the ubi sunt formula is subordinated to a more varied style of complaint (Testament, 407-69, TC, V, 218-45). Perhaps the greatest tribute to Henryson's skill in versification is the brilliant effect to which he puts the highly intricate stanza form of Anelida's complaint in Anelida and Arcite. There, the nine-line stanzas rhyming aabaabbab are remarkable only as a technical tour de force, but in Cresseid's complaint they acquire the dignity of a suitable emotional and dramatic context. Cresseid's complaint has an emotional urgency which is entirely lacking in the Anelida and Arcite complaint, and Henryson's choice of the distinctively Chaucerian form reflects confidence in his ability to succeed where Chaucer failed.

In the Testament Henryson creates an exemplum for his audience, an illustration of the pain and sorrow which inevitably follow untruth in love. This lesson is developed in a variety of ways, some of them highly original: for example, the creation of an allegorical substructure, the juxtaposition of poet and heroine, and the allusions to Chaucer's poem. The thematic emphasis on truth in love is essentially the same as that of Troilus and Criseyde, and Henryson draws - albeit imaginatively - on aspects of Chaucer's style. This can be seen in the manner of the narrator, in the system of ironic references to Fortune, in the allusion to authority, and in a willingness to allow meaning to develop through description and direct speech. Henryson's major contribution to the story of Troilus and Cressid lies in his handling of the heroine. Cresseid's

story moves us as it does not so much because she suffers, as because she grows in moral stature to the point where she recognizes the nature and extent of her error. This regeneration is significant in the general sense that it reflects Henryson's faith in the ability and willingness of mankind to respond in this life to the Good, even when it has fallen to the point of apparent despair. Henryson's humane optimism, which has not been sufficiently emphasized by commentators, has no counterpart in Troilus and Criseyde. Chaucer's translation of Troilus to the heavens suggests no comparable faith in man's ability to attain self-awareness in this life. Henryson would doubtless have agreed with Chaucer that, viewed from the perspective of eternity, human love is a thing of small value ("The more of age the nerar hevynnis blisse"), but his willingness to retain a this-worldly focus on his "matere" evinces a humaneness which we glimpse less clearly at the end of Troilus and Criseyde.

Treatments of the Troilus-Cressid story in the sixteenth century indicate a history of "Henryson misunderstood". Hyder E. Rollins, who gathers together a wide variety of Elizabethan allusions to Cressid and her lovers,⁵⁴ explains that "every mention of Cressid as a leper, at least to 1600, is an allusion to Chaucer: nobody had ever heard of Robert Henryson, schoolmaster".⁵⁵ The fact that sixteenth century readers came to the Testament as a sixth book of Troilus and Criseyde, like the other five written by Chaucer, was an inducement to make a comparison between the two lovers on the basis of Troilus's theatrical ascent to the eighth

sphere. Cresseid does not make this journey; ergo, she is damned, and a late sixteenth century ballad shows her suffering the torments of hell, while Troilus fans the flames.⁵⁶

In Henryson's poem there is of course no suggestion of damnation for Cresseid. The reference to Diana hints rather at salvation, and the poet's reluctance to set her experience within a specifically Christian context serves not to condemn Cresseid, but to emphasize her greatness in outgrowing her initial presumption and untruth. Henryson redeems Cresseid by showing her to be something more than the archetypal unfaithful woman which in both his own and Chaucer's poem she alleges herself to be.⁵⁷ Elizabethan poetasters, however, found that there was more poetic capital to be made by concentrating on the less positive side of Henryson's emphasis on the temporal world.⁵⁸ The following are typical sixteenth century descriptions of Cressid's life as a leper:

Her comly corpes that Troylus did delight
 All puft with plages full lothsomly there lay:
 Hir Azurde vaines, her Cristall skinne so whight,
 With Purple spots, was falne in great decay:
 Hir wrinkeled face once fayre doth fade away,
 Thus she abode plagde in midst of this hir youth,
 Was forst to beg for breaking of hir truth.

.....
 Lo here the ende of wanton wicked life,
 Lo here the fruit that Sinne both sowes and reapes;
 Lo here of vice the right rewarde and knife,
 That cutth of cleane and tombleth downe in heapes..

(Thomas Howell, "The britlenesse of thinges
 mortall, and the trustinesse of Vertue":
Newe Sonets and Pretie Pamphlets, 1580)⁵⁹

Glad is she now a browne breade crust to gnawe,
 Who, deintie once, on finest cates did frowne;
 To couch upon soft seames a pad of straw,
 Where halfe mislikt were stately beds of downe:
 By neede enforst, she begs on every clowne
 On whom but late the best would gifts bestow;

But squemish then, God dyld ye, she said no.

.....
 Loe! here the fruits of lust and lawlesse love,
 Loe! here their faults that vale to either vice;
 Loe! ladyes, here their falles (for your behove)
 Whose wanton willes sets light by sound advice.
 Here dunghill kyte from kinde will never flye...

(George Whetstone, The Rocke of Regard,
 1576)⁶⁰

It is very interesting to observe that Howell, Whetstone, and George Gascoigne⁶¹ all combine the details of Henryson's description with the condemnatory rhetoric of Chaucer's conclusion. Henryson is much more charitable in condemning the sin, but ultimately not the sinner.

That it is the Cresseid of the beginning rather than the end of the Testament who excited the imaginations of sixteenth century writers is abundantly clear in the frequent allusions to her as a prostitute. By the third quarter of the sixteenth century "Cressides kinde" had become not merely a way of designating an unfaithful woman, but a synonym for whore. Turberville, for example, calls his false mistress "faire Cresides heire", hurling the taunt "I yeeld thee vp to Diomed,/ to glut his filthie lust",⁶² while the author of A Poore Knight's Pallace of Priuate Pleasures shows Cressid offering herself to Troilus and Diomedes at the same time.⁶³ This conception of Cressid influences her characterization in Heywood's play The Iron Age, where she is described as "compact/ Meerely of blood, of bones and rotten flesh,/ Which makes her Leaprous".⁶⁴ Since Cressid had become an object of scorn and contempt by the later part of the sixteenth century, it is not surprising that Shakespeare depicts her as he does. It is reason-

able to assume that Shakespeare had read the Testament, since all sixteenth century editions of Chaucer included the spurious sixth book: the wooing scene (III, ii) is quite clearly derived from Troilus and Criseyde. The image of Cressid as a wanton, inspired by Henryson and deprived of its complexity by later poets, is apparent in the scene in which Cressida kisses and flirts with the Greek commanders (IV, v): the reception is designed as a test by Ulysses, and it gives him the authority to denounce her as one of the "daughters of the game" (54-63).⁶⁵ There is a later allusion to Henryson's heroine when she cries out in hysteria to Diomedes, "Do come - I shall be plagued" (V, ii, 2). She is not, however, actually smitten by disease and made to suffer, and this lack of poetic justice is regarded by Rollins as an artistic flaw sufficiently serious to call into question the authorship of the final act of Troilus and Cressida: "Yet we could feel surer that Shakespeare was responsible for all of the play if he had punished Cressida, - if in portraying her he had unmistakably shown bitterness and hatred".⁶⁶ It is arguable that a portrayal of punishment for Cressida would have diverted attention away from the theme of justice and truth in war, but it is equally likely that Shakespeare's portrayal of Cressida is conditioned by a distaste for the crudeness and vulgarity which predominate in earlier sixteenth century portraits. Shakespeare points to the character's traditional faults, but he is at the same time sympathetic in his presentation of her: this much is indicated by the memories of Troilus which assail her as she is wooed by Diomedes (V, ii).

Although there is no place for regeneration or purgation in Shakespeare's play, it marks a reaction against the prevailing sixteenth century trivialization of the Troilus-Cressida story as it is handled by Henryson and Chaucer. Troilus and Cressida abounds in references to repelling physical disfiguration and disease: the most notable of these occur in the choric commentaries of Thersites upon the heroes and heroines of Greece and Troy, but the imagery of sickness is also part of Troilus's sensuous love poetry. The play ends on the sombre note of an address to "traders and bawds", and Pandarus bequeaths his venereal disease to the audience. Physical disease is the outward manifestation of moral corruption on a cosmic scale - "wars and lechery; nothing else holds fashion" - and the action of the play exemplifies the disorder which follows unbridled individualism. I suggest that Shakespeare's preoccupation with disease in this play may owe something to his reading of the Testament: i.e., that the dramatist extended Henryson's description of the effects of a sin against the natural order into an indictment of disorder on a much larger scale. Imagery related to sickness and decay is of course by no means uncommon in Shakespearean drama, but in no other play are the effects so vivid and so concentrated, or so obviously linked to the theme of lechery. The debt to Henryson cannot be proved, but Shakespeare's knowledge of the poem, and the thematic continuity between poem and play, are beyond dispute.⁶⁷

Shakespeare's play is not the only late sixteenth century work which offers a sympathetic treatment of Chaucer's

and Henryson's heroine. The Laste Epistle of Creseyd to Troyalus, which was probably written by William Fowler (one of James VI's Castalian Band and secretary to Queen Anne in England) at the turn of the sixteenth century,⁶⁸ is a continuation of both Troilus and Criseyde and the Testament, remarkable because it is uncontaminated by the popular sixteenth century idea of Cressid's baseness. The poet may well have been prompted to write a continuation of the story (which he regarded as a single poem written by Chaucer) by other works which blazoned forth its heroine's perfidy. This is the implication of these lines in which Creseyd regrets that she had not died as a child:

Then should no poet haue the cause
 Faire Creyseydes treuthe to blame,
 nor after this with ladyes falce
 Remember Creseydes name;
 Ne yet no mann his fickle dame
 With Creseyd should vpbraid,
 Nor by examples bringe me in
 How Troyolus was betrayde. (25-32)

These "examples" no doubt include the prophetic cry of Chaucer's heroine ("for thise bokes wol me shende"), but they have a more particular applicability to the group of sixteenth century poems in which the poet-lover scornfully likens his mistress to Cressid.⁶⁹ The sixteenth century assumption of her damnation is also touched on in the lament that Troilus's "cursinges" weigh her "downe to hell" (171).

The manner in which the Scots poet continues the six-book Troilus and Criseyde is similar in its selectivity to the manner in which Henryson continues Chaucer's poem. Fowler (if so the author be) ignores as Henryson does the

account of Troilus's death and salvation, and just as Henryson alters the details of Chaucer's narrative in the matter of revealing Cressid's fall to Troilus, Fowler in turn ignores the Henrysonian invention of Cressid's life in the "Court commoun". In the new version of Cressid's testament there is no suggestion that she had any lovers other than Troilus and Diomedes. Most of the circumstances to which Fowler's heroine refers in her death-bed letter to Troilus are drawn from the Testament. As in Henryson's poem, her death is hastened by the encounter with Troilus in which she fails to recognize him:

My wish vnseene was but to see
 The ones before my deathe,
 Which sight vnawares yet longe desyred
 Dothe stopp my vitall breathe.. (5-8)

and the detail of having letter and ring sent to him after her death is based on Henryson's reference to the ring brought to Troilus after Cresseid's death. The references in the Epistle to the leprosy punishment (257-60), to the indelible imprint of the lover's image "in mowld of memory" (277-84), and to the epitaph (305), are also drawn from the Testament. Fowler's major departure from Henryson's poem lies in the new Cressid's failure to admit any personal responsibility for her fate: the nearest she comes to Henryson's "Nane but my self as now I will accuse" is the admission that she had been "to hastye" in submitting to Diomedes (167). The writer of the letter urges Troilus to believe that she has been throughout her life the victim of "the froward fates": if Paris had not survived to manhood the Trojan wars would never have occurred, and her husband

would not have been killed, thereby exposing her honour to peril (33-70); if fate had not decreed that she and Thoas be exchanged for Antenor, she would have lived happily with Troilus (87-100); if Troilus had not been "affrayde" (an interesting addition), she would never have remained in the Greek camp to be tempted by Diomede (117-20).... At one point, she turns angrily upon those (like Henryson and Chaucer) who deny the determining power of Fortune:

Than out on all these dreyry dames
That destenyges dothe dispyse! (101-2)

The characterization of Creseyd is very skilfully done, reflecting a sensitive appreciation of passages such as the prevaricating letter in Troilus and Criseyde (V, 1590-1631), and the pathetically self-indulgent complaint in the Testament. Despite her leprosy, Fowler's character has more in common with Chaucer's pitiably attractive heroine than with the mature and self-aware Cresseid at the end of Henryson's poem.

Poets who follow Henryson, like some of his modern critics, steadfastly refuse to concede that Cressid could be anything more than one whose example of inconstancy should be shunned, although some of them (notably Shakespeare and Fowler) are more sympathetic than others to the pathos of her situation. Henryson's poem does of course succeed admirably in presenting its lesson about the evils which ensue from untruth in love, but the implied moralitas is so memorable only because the poet has sufficient compassion to endow his character with a greatness in

isolation which is inconceivable in the heroine of Troilus and Criseyde. The continuing interest of sixteenth century poets, both English and Scottish, in the story of Cressid is powerful testimony to the influence of the Testament, even though none of them choose to echo Henryson's Christian-humanist affirmation of the greatness of the human spirit in adversity.

Chapter IV

The Morall Fabillis and the English fable tradition.

There are no difficulties involved in accepting that the Testament of Cresseid has close connections with Chaucer's poetry, since both narrative details and certain stylistic features have sources in Troilus and Criseyde. Apart from Chaucer's poem, Henryson's only other literary sources are Boccaccio's De Genealogia Deorum and The Assembly of Gods, which together provide the background of the parliament episode. The question of sources and literary relationships becomes considerably more complex when we turn to the Morall Fabillis, since Henryson drew for details of his plots and some of his thematic emphases on a wide variety of works belonging to the long-established traditions of Aesopic fable, beast epic, and exemplum.¹ Henryson calls his work "a maner of translatioun": the Fabillis are in no sense literal translations, but rather highly creative expansions and adaptations of material inherited from such diverse sources as the twelfth century Latin verse Romulus of Gualterus Anglicus, its derivatives the French Isopets, the French beast epic Roman de Renart, and the sermon exempla of Odo of Cheriton. The concern of this chapter is with one aspect only of Henryson's internationalism - the use which he makes of the fables and fable collections written in the language which was much closer than either French or Latin to his own "moder tong".

The Morall Fabillis are the most complex and successful examples of their kind in "Inglis". Henryson's motives for writing a number of moralized animal stories are of course impossible to determine, but it is possible that he set out

to write something which had not been written before in either English or Scots. The earliest known English collection of fables is Lydgate's Isopes Fabules,² written early in the fifteenth century, and probably modelled on one of the French or Latin descendants of the Latin verse Romulus.³ Like Henryson's work, Lydgate's is a small collection of moralized tales introduced by a short Prologue, but the English work belongs to an altogether lesser order of art. It is at best drab and undistinguished verse, showing a characteristic Lydgatian inability to develop narrative or characterization: the stories are a feeble foundation upon which are erected a series of trite and repetitive moralitates. Some of the differences between Lydgate's work and Henryson's will be considered below, but it may be noted here that the English fables are devoid of the Henrysonian combination of wit and moral seriousness. The intellectual energy of the Fabillis is one of their most compelling qualities, and one of the ways in which it manifests itself is in the challenge offered to the audience to perceive the relevance of moralitas to tale in several of the fables. Although Henryson's fables are unified by their uniformly high artistic standards and by the intensity of their commitment to moral ideals, close examination indicates a diversity of form and structure. Six of the thirteen have the appearance of being conceived as independent fables, in the manner of Lydgate's work:⁴ The Cock and the Fox, The Fox and the Wolf, and The Trial of the Fox comprise a miniature beast epic, The Tod,⁵ which is related to another linked pair of fables, The Fox, the Wolf and the

Cadger, and The Fox, the Wolf and the Husbandman. There are thematic and structural links between two "nature prologue" fables, The Lion and the Mouse and The Preaching of the Swallow.⁶ This formal diversity indicates Henryson's desire to improve upon the rather piecemeal structure of the Lydgatian Isopet, although it is doubtful whether he intended his work to have the kind of unity which it acquires by being printed as a single and continuous collection. The Fabillis were probably worked on and circulated in groups over a considerable period of time.

Two post-Lydgatian English collections of moralized animal stories provide more valuable assistance than any other source of information in the dating of Henryson's fables. These are Caxton's The History of Reynard the Fox (1481),⁷ and his Aesop (1484).⁸ The first of these is a translation, in unpolished but vigorous prose, of a Flemish original: because of the continuity provided by its central character, the work is a beast epic rather than an Aesopic collection. The second is a fairly literal prose translation of Jules de Machault's French version of Steinhöwel's German Asop. The literary value of Caxton's work rests in its swiftness of pace and its deft touches of fabliau-style humour rather than in any complexity of style or meaning, and no one could seriously suggest that Henryson could have learned anything about good writing from either the Aesop or the Reynard.

The third major example of English fable writing before

the end of the fifteenth century, Chaucer's The Nun's Priest's Tale, is from a literary standpoint more readily comparable with Henryson's achievement than the fable collections of Lydgate or Caxton, and it is probably for this reason that Chaucer's brilliant parody of the traditional cock and fox story has often been discussed in connection with Henryson's treatment of the same tale. There is reason to believe that the Tale, along with the later English fable collections, was known to Henryson, and since it is the only one which can arguably have influenced both subject matter and style in the Morall Fabillis, consideration of the English affinities of Henryson's work should begin with Chaucer.

There has been a tendency on the part of some critics to regard The Cock and the Fox (the first part of The Tod) as another instance of the kind of Chaucer-adaptation that The Testament of Cresseid illustrates. The Testament is the only one of Henryson's works which can be described as "Chaucerian", and misunderstanding of the nature and extent of Chaucer's influence has produced T.F. Henderson's pronouncement that Henryson "perhaps allowed his admiration for the 'flower' of 'Makarism' to override too much his own personality".⁹ In the opinion of H.S. Bennett, Henryson's originality rests in his "provincialism" rather than in the kind of independence of Chaucer which Dunbar's poetry illustrates.¹⁰ Not all criticism, of course, has taken this extreme view: MacQueen and Jamieson, notably, show in considerable detail the extent to which Henryson borrows

from and adapts a variety of sources, always adding his own distinctive thematic emphases in his own distinctive way. Charles Elliott makes the valuable general point that "If the expression 'Scottish Chaucerian' is to be applied to Henryson, it must connote qualities of wit, control, urbanity, ironic juxtaposing, sympathy, an engaging demand for co-operation of the audience, and fluency of metre and diction".¹¹ (It will be necessary to return later to the question of stylistic affinity between the poetry of Chaucer and Henryson.)

Two recent essays on Henryson's Fabillis by Donald MacDonald attempt to define what the work owes to Chaucer's poetry in terms of narrative development and style.¹² MacDonald's criticism demands serious attention because it argues for a degree of indebtedness to Chaucer which has not been advocated before - at least in such detail. Since no critical response has been forthcoming, the following discussion of the relationship between The Nun's Priest's Tale and The Cock and the Fox is largely concerned with testing the validity of MacDonald's claims. I hope to show that this new advocacy of Henryson's Chaucerianism is too emphatic - i.e., that it fails to make certain discriminations which are necessary to a proper understanding of Henryson's use of Chaucer.

MacDonald embarks on the daunting task of providing "proof" of the assumption that Henryson must have made use of The Nun's Priest's Tale for his own handling of the same

basic fable. Preliminary allowance for three possibilities in the history of the fable, all of which would tend to argue against Henryson's reliance on Chaucer, is made:

(1) that the details which are shared by The Nun's Priest's Tale and The Cock and the Fox may have been derived from some version of the fable intermediate between Chaucer and Henryson; (2) that Henryson, without knowing Chaucer's poem, took what appear to be original elements in Chaucer's work from a source of the latter which no longer exists; (3) that the shared elements of the English and the Scots fables may be explained as Henryson's original contributions - again without a knowledge of The Nun's Priest's Tale.¹³ These three possibilities can, as MacDonald explains, be reasonably discounted, but only because all of them assume Henryson's complete ignorance of The Nun's Priest's Tale. A fourth possibility, which MacDonald does not mention, seems to be more likely than any of the others. This is, that Henryson did know Chaucer's poem (it would be surprising if he did not, given the other indications that The Canterbury Tales were known in Scotland), together with another version of the story of the cock and the fox which is no longer extant. It is possible that this hypothetical poem provided a source for The Nun's Priest's Tale: Chaucer's poem has affinities with both one branch of the Roman de Renart and the German Reinhart Fuchs,¹⁴ but some of the differences between Chaucer's treatment of the story and these may be explained by the possibility that he worked from a variant of either the French or the German poem,¹⁵ or alternatively, from a source which combines elements drawn from both.¹⁶

Despite the similarities, there are striking differences between Chaucer's and Henryson's treatments of the fable, and it is important that the desire to base a tidy argument for indebtedness, based on the points of resemblance, should not prevent full recognition of these differences, and of the implications of a lost version. It might be objected that the differences between the English and the Scots treatments of the same basic story point to a simple "originality factor": Chaucer altered the details of a known source such as the Roman de Renart, Henryson in turn adapted Chaucer's poem, eliminating most of its entertaining digressiveness in accordance with his own aesthetic principles. This view may be near to the truth, but its very neatness makes it suspect. The genealogy of a fable is very rarely simple. There are, for example, at least four extant versions of the cock and fox fable, written prior to The Nun's Priest's Tale. Why may there not have been more, written down or orally transmitted, composed before or after Chaucer's tale, but no longer in existence? Jamieson, who has examined the antecedents of the Fabillis with admirable thoroughness, stresses at the beginning of his thesis that what he denotes as "sources" for any particular fable may be indirect rather than direct sources: i.e., that the fables which Henryson knew and used may not always be the versions that have been preserved, but rather works which derive from these, or from which they have been derived.¹⁷

MacDonald's article is concerned solely with parallels of narrative detail between Henryson's fable and Chaucer's,

but none of them are sufficiently close to prove Henryson's indebtedness. In fact, the most important of them suggest indebtedness to a source other than Chaucer. The first of the parallels is that Henryson agrees with Chaucer in making the owner of the cock a poor widow rather than a rich farmer (Constans de Noes in the Roman de Renart). Henryson may have borrowed this detail from Chaucer, but there are reasons for supposing that he did not. In the first place, his description of the widow's goods makes specific reference to a source:

A wedow dwelt intill a drope thay dais,
quhilk wan hir fude with spinning on hir rok,
and had no moir guidis, as the fable sais,
except of hennis scho had a lytill flock... (st.3, 1-4)

Chaucer's "povre wydwe" is considerably more affluent: she has three sows, three cows, and a sheep. There is also a difference of occupation: Chaucer's widow is "a maner deye" (2846), whereas Henryson's earns her living by spinning. The Ormesby Psalter (made early in the fourteenth century) contains a drawing of an unaccompanied woman with a distaff in her hand, chasing a fox which is bearing away a large cock in its mouth,¹⁸ and a later fourteenth century misericord carving in St. Botolph's Church, Boston, shows a similar representation.¹⁹ Kenneth Varty describes and illustrates a number of other such scenes in pre-Chaucerian English art, in which the property of the woman with the distaff is either a goose or a duck.²⁰ These graphic illustrations make no sense other than in terms of a well-known story which has not survived, and it is likely that it is this story, rather than The Nun's Priest Tale, upon

which Henryson's depiction of the widow is modelled.²¹ Further evidence of the existence of another version of the story is provided by the reference in The Kingis Quair to "The wyly fox, the wedowis inemye" (156.4). The suggestion has been made that this may be an indirect reference to The Nun's Priest's Tale,²² but it seems ~~just as~~ likely that the reference is to an older story. A detail of a late fourteenth century poem, however appealing, seems unlikely to have become proverbial usage within the space of thirty or forty years. Varty points out that it is not until the sixteenth century that a recognizably Chaucerian treatment of the cock and fox story becomes evident in art.²³

MacDonald's second point, that Henryson's "procedure in naming the characters in CF is exactly parallel to Chaucer's use in the NPT",²⁴ is even less persuasive. Henryson uses the names Chanteclere and Partlot for the cock and his paramour (cf. Chauntecleer and Pertelote), and to this extent only his practice may be modelled on that of The Nun's Priest's Tale. Unlike Chaucer, Henryson names the other wives, of which there are two rather than six. Their names, Sprowtok and Coppok (in the Bannatyne version) are derived from those of poultry characters in earlier fable literature: e.g., Sprotinus is the cock in the Ysengrimus, and Coppa is the hen in both the Speculum Stultorum and the Roman de Renart.²⁵ Smith was the first to point out that Henryson may have culled the names for his hens from Colkelbie Sow, III, 99-120,²⁶ but there is reason to believe that the latter may have been taken from Henryson.²⁷

Henryson's fox is called Lourence, Chaucer's, "daun Russell". Both poems have a list of dogs (as does the Roman de Renart), but Henryson's list is considerably longer than the other, and includes none of Chaucer's names (cf. NPT 3383, CF st. 22, 3-4). The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this supposed "parallel" is that Henryson's practice in naming his characters bears very little relation to Chaucer's practice in The Nun's Priest's Tale.

The physical beauty of the cock in both fables is, according to MacDonald,²⁸ further evidence of Henryson's indebtedness to Chaucer. This may be doubted, however, for the simple reason that there is no equivalent to the narrator's extended piece of courtly description in The Nun's Priest's Tale, 2859-64. The flattering words of Henryson's fox are, in fact, concerned very little with physical beauty. He remarks merely that Chanteclere's feathers are "fair and gent" (st.9, 1), a detail which is reminiscent less of Chaucer than of Marie de France.²⁹

MacDonald cites three further parallels between The Cock and the Fox and The Nun's Priest's Tale which are closer than those mentioned above. The emphasis placed on the dependability of the cock's singing, and the use of the "orlogge" metaphor (NPT 2854; CF st.15, 4) are interesting departures from the known versions of the fable, and it may be that Henryson borrowed these details from Chaucer. The same might be said of the fact that in both poems the fox uses an elaborate test of imitation to deceive the cock:

part of the test is that the bird should stand upon tiptoes to crow, thereby emulating his father (NPT 3331; CF st.11, 1). Further, the detail - found in no other known versions - that the fox tries to persuade the cock to descend from the tree (which in turn has the effect of reversing the traditional order of the concluding speeches), may indicate Henryson's use of Chaucer. It must be kept in mind, though, that in none of these instances does Henryson follow Chaucer exactly: in Henryson, the praise of Chanteclere's song on the grounds of its accuracy and dependability is given to a hen rather than to the beguiling fox: Henryson's imitation test involves the cock in turning "thryis about" as he winks and crows, a detail which is not to be found in Chaucer: the blandishment offered to tempt the cock from the tree is different in Henryson's fable, as is the ruse by which the cock persuades the fox to open his mouth. These differences may merely reflect Henryson's originality in the handling of a Chaucerian source, but on the other hand they may indicate Henryson's use of a non-Chaucerian source.

MacDonald devotes considerable attention to the longest single episode in each poem - the debate between Chauntecleer and Pertelote on the validity of dreams in The Nun's Priest's Tale, and the reactions of the three wives to the cock's disappearance in The Cock and the Fox. The point to be noticed here is that the subject matter and tone of the "digression" in Henryson's fable are considerably removed from Chaucer's mock-heroic account of dreams, with its implications about human vanity. If Henryson was inspired

by the debate in The Nun's Priest's Tale for his own dramatic account of hypocritical self-interest, it is very clear that he set out to write a very different kind of debate. The episode in The Cock and the Fox is not so much a debate as a series of choric speeches which deflate the various kinds of presumption illustrated by the three speakers.

Those narrative details common to the English and Scots treatments of the cock and fox fable do not, in my view, provide a conclusive argument for Henryson's indebtedness to Chaucer. The possibility that The Cock and the Fox may have been modelled to a considerable extent on a non-extant version of the tale which resembled The Nun's Priest's Tale in certain respects is a very real one, and for this reason absolute certainty about Henryson's sources and his use of them cannot be achieved. Refusal to recognize this possibility is the condition underlying MacDonald's point-by-point "proof" of Henryson's indebtedness to The Nun's Priest's Tale. It would be foolish to press the opposite of that view, that Henryson took nothing at all from The Nun's Priest's Tale: similarities between the two do exist, and it is extremely unlikely that Henryson did not know The Canterbury Tales. No doubt some of the parallels discussed by MacDonald do indicate that Henryson had borrowed from Chaucer, but there is absolutely no way of knowing how many come into this category.

An affinity of style rather than of subject matter between the two poems may well provide an indication of the

use which Henryson made of The Nun's Priest's Tale. For example, there is an echo in Henryson's poem of the mock-heroic and parodic effects which are integral to the Tale. Henryson, like Chaucer, characterizes a hen as a courtly heroine. In Chaucer, Pertelote is "curteys.. discreet, and debonaire", and when Chauntecleer is taken her grief is reported in suitably elevated terms (3355-73). In the Scots fable, a lofty lament comes from the beak of Partlot:

'Alace,' quod Partlot, makand sair murning,
with teiris grete attour hir chekis fell,
'Yone was our droure and our dayis darling,
oure nychtingale and als our horlage bell,
oure walcryif weche us for to warne and tell
quhen that Aurora with hir curchis gray
put up hir hede betwix the nycht and the day! (st.15)

It must be added that Henryson parodies courtly rhetoric in his treatment of Partlot for a different reason. Whereas Chaucer plays on the disparity between the farmyard reality and its inflated mode of expression to achieve an effect which is near to farce, Henryson uses parody as a vehicle for moral judgement: like the fox, his avian heroine is "willye" (st.14. 5; st.5. 1), and her inflated lament, like her sister Coppok's sermonizing, is a cover for her real feelings about Chanteclere's disappearance. Henryson's description of the Widow's extreme reaction to the rape of the cock,

As scho war wod, with monye yell and cry
ryvand hir hair, upoun hir breist can bete:
syne pail of hew, half in ane exstasye,
fel down for cair in swoning and in swete.. (st.14, 1-4)

has the same mock-heroic flavour as Chaucer's account of the hens' reaction. The fact that both poems make skilful use of a courtly frame of reference may also indicate that

Henryson had Chaucer in mind. The Scots cock is introduced as "gentill Chanteclere", and this may well have been intended to evoke recollection of Chaucer's courtier bird. More significant than the resemblance itself is the distinctive use to which Henryson puts the concept of "gentill-esse". As MacQueen explains, the fox's principal appeal is to the cock's sense of nobility, and Chanteclere falls because he accepts a false estimation of family status and prowess.³⁰ The capture, which is Henryson's way of showing that presumption to a status inappropriate to one's natural capabilities is folly, is a kind of moral allegory which clearly has no counterpart in The Nun's Priest's Tale. The theme of degeneracy is explored further in the second and third parts of The Tod: the fox who captures Chanteclere would, like his victim, "fane pretend a gentill stait" (st.45, 7), and in the case of the fox belief in his own inviolability leads to crime and thence to death. The son who succeeds to the "airschip" is, by the laws of nature, an even more degenerate "gentill" than his father (59-61). Henryson's treatment of the father-son relationship in his miniature beast-epic illustrates very well his power to combine traditional material with his own distinctive thematic concerns.

Although some kind of direct link between The Cock and the Fox and The Nun's Priest's Tale probably does exist, it is impossible to define it accurately, and what is more remarkable is Henryson's independence of Chaucer. As is so frequently the case in the relationship of Middle Scots

poems to English sources, the varius sis offers more insights into the nature of the Scots work than the tamen idem aspect of the classical axiom. There are differences between The Cock and the Fox and The Nun's Priest's Tale in terms of theme and moral interpretation, tone and style, and narrative detail. Chaucer's fable is by no means devoid of moral meaning, but throughout there is at least an equal emphasis on various kinds of stylistic excess. The life of this Tale stems from its prodigious use of various kinds of amplificatio - these include several passages of description in the high style, a proliferation of exempla, and an abundance of apostrophe and exclamatio. The meaning of The Nun's Priest's Tale depends on its manner as much as on its matter: Chaucer is drawing attention to the dangers of an indiscriminating use of the "colours" prescribed in treatises such as Geoffrey de Vinsauf's Poetria Nova. Some of these devices are, of course, used to express the absurdity of vainglory, and the unspecified "fruyt" of the Nun's Priest's mock moralitas is the subject to which Henryson turns at the end of his tale - "Fy! pompous pryd, thou art rycht poysonable!/ Quha favouris thee of force man have a fall" (st.29, 1-2). As we have already seen, Henryson uses parody for the purposes of moral discrimination rather than for literary satire per se. In terms of theme, The Cock and the Fox differs from The Nun's Priest's Tale in that it gives equal emphasis to the sins of pride and flattery: this is shown by the detail that the fox's temptation speech is considerably longer than its Chaucerian counterpart, and its psychology of flattery much more elaborate. The result

of the greater emphasis given to flattery in the Scots poem is that the fox's concluding plea and the cock's indignant refusal acquire a force which the corresponding lines in The Nun's Priest's Tale do not have. The greater seriousness of Henryson's moral purpose is also apparent in the obituaries delivered by the three hens. Each exemplifies some facet of pride: Partlot in her presumption to a courtliness which is foreign to her nature, Sprowtok in her strongly appetitive complacency, and Coppok in her sanctimonious pose as an interpreter of God's purpose.³¹ The episode carries a further lesson, explained by MacQueen as "the arbitrariness of posthumous reputation in relation to such an ideal of nobility as is represented by Chantecleir".³²

The tone of Henryson's poem is, in general terms, much more serious than that of The Nun's Priest's Tale. This is partly due to the greater emphasis given to questions of personal morality, and partly to the fact that in Henryson's poem the moralitas is the logical culmination of the tale itself, instead of being an artful parody of the conventional way of concluding a fable. The expression of the poet's conviction that there is an urgent need to avoid sinful self-deception has no counterpart in Chaucer's fable or, for that matter, in any but a few lines of Chaucer's poetry. Henryson's greater seriousness is not altogether a matter of greater explicitness in discussing points of "moralite": the moralitas of The Cock and the Fox carefully refrains from reference to the episode of the hens. (This kind of understatement would probably be given the label "Chaucerian"

by the critics who applaud the indirectness of Chaucer's method.)³³ The omission is an example of the intellectual wit which Henryson displays in his handling of the moralitas convention. Elsewhere in the Fabillis - for example, The Cock and the Jasp and The Trial of the Fox - the moral application is not what we would have expected, and the result is to compel reinterpretation of the taill itself in terms of its moralitas. Humour, as distinct from this kind of intellectual manipulation, is part of the technique of The Cock and the Fox, but it is different in kind from that of The Nun's Priest's Tale. There is none of the broad comedy which comes from Chaucer's use of mock-heroics, or from a detail such as Pertelote's request that her husband should take "som laxatyf". Henryson's effects are less obtrusive, sometimes playing on the connotations of a single word. (Note, for example, the brilliant use of "swete" in st.7, 7.)

At the other end of the tonal range, there is no Chaucerian equivalent to Henryson's kind of "high seriousness", in particular, to his use of direct address to press home to his audience the need for reform. In The Cock and the Fox, he implores "guid folk" to beware of flattery and vainglory, and elsewhere the tone of warning gives way to the more serious one of stern reproof directed at particular sections of society, as in The Wolf and the Lamb. (It seems hardly necessary to add that the topicality associated with the stringency of tone in this and other fables has no equivalent in Chaucer's poetry.) In general, Chaucer's

passages of direct address on questions of morality are much less explicit, although the ending of Troilus and Criseyde is an obvious exception. Pearsall observes that Chaucer's handling of the fable in The Nun's Priest's Tale and The Manciple's Tale reflects "his exploratory progress through various 'exemplary' forms of narration, and his sloughing off of the externally imposed moralisation".³⁴ Even in these tales, where the moralitates are tinged with irony, Chaucer avoids the need for personal comment by using narrators who are clearly not spokesmen for the poet. Going beyond The Cock and the Fox and The Nun's Priest's Tale, it may seem tempting to posit a Chaucerian source for one of Henryson's most memorable outcries against injustice, the complaint of the exploited sheep at the end of The Sheep and the Dog. Here Henryson departs from his normal practice of expressing the moralitas in his own person, although there is every indication that the sheep is meant to serve as the spokesman for the poet:³⁵

Seis thow nocht, Lord, this warld overturnit is,
 As guha wald change gud gold in leid or tyn;
 The pure is peilit, the lord may do na miss;
 Now Simonie is haldin for na syn.
 Now is he blyth with okkir maist may wyn;
 Gentrice is slane, and pietie is ago,
 Allace, Lord, quhy thoilis thow it so? (1314-20)

In its interrogatory tone, which conveys the sense of man's extreme difficulty in understanding the divine purpose, the passage is reminiscent of the constable's exclamation about the apparent arbitrariness of divine justice in The Man of Law's Tale:

"Lord Crist," quod he, "how may this world endure,
 So ful of synne is many a creature?"

"O myghty God, if that it be thy wille,
 Sith thou art rightful juge, how may it be
 That thou wolt suffren innocentz to spille,
 And wikked folk regne in prosperitee?" (811-16)

The resemblances of tone, style, and subject matter are, however, less likely to be explained by Henryson's borrowing from Chaucer than by the probability that both drew independently on either the Psalms or Boethius.³⁶ It will be obvious that Chaucer's appeal is placed within a more insistently dramatic context than Henryson's, and that the particularity of Henryson's lines has no counterpart in the passage from The Man of Law's Tale.

MacDonald's second essay, referred to earlier, puts forward the view that Henryson is indebted to Chaucer for one of the stylistic features of the Fabillis, the use of proverbs and sententiae for the purposes of comic irony in passages of direct speech. Like MacDonald's article on the indebtedness of The Cock and the Fox to The Nun's Priest's Tale, the argument for this kind of stylistic indebtedness is flawed by the insistence that Henryson's source for certain effects must have been Chaucer. The use of Latin quotation to give an appearance of learned sagacity to an opinion which is not seriously adhered to by the speaker - as, for example, in the fox's "Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautem",³⁷ or the mouse's "Distortum vultum sequitur distortio morum"³⁸ - is in fact not really the same thing as Chauntecleer's use of the tag "Mulier est hominis confusio" in The Nun's Priest's Tale. Quite clearly, Henryson does not quote inaccurately to achieve his

comic effects: the irony rests in the application of the sententiae. MacDonald draws attention also to the swallow's text "Nam leuius laedit quicquid praevidimus ante" in The Preaching of the Swallow (1754).³⁹ If English precedents for this kind of serious quotation are sought, they will be found not in Chaucer, but in the miniature sermons which punctuate Piers Plowman. MacDonald cites several instances in the Fabillis of proverbs which are used speciously, to highlight either the ignorance or the cynicism of the beast characters who use them: examples of the first effect are the "wisdom" of the cock in The Cock and the Jasp (102), and of the lark in The Preaching of the Swallow (1763-7); an example of the second effect is the wolf's pious avowal that "neid may haif na law" in the second part of The Tod (st.48, 6). These passages are related in only a very general way to the use of proverbs by Nicholas and John in The Miller's Tale,⁴⁰ and the parallel cannot be used legitimately to indicate indebtedness on Henryson's part. The same must be said of the use of series of proverbs for the purposes of characterization, as, for example, in The Preaching of the Swallow, 1763-7, The Fox, the Wolf and the Cadger, 2009-10, and The Cock and the Fox, st.18, 6-7. Henryson needed no literary precedent for this kind of effect - it is a common enough feature of any kind of colloquial speech. It is of course possible that Henryson may have been moved to make dramatic capital out of familiar Scots proverb clusters; e.g., The Bruce, Book XI, 21-30. The parallels between Henryson's and Chaucer's use of proverbs and sententiae for ironic effect in passages of direct

speech are neither sufficiently numerous nor sufficiently close to suggest that Henryson was imitating an aspect of Chaucer's style. Henryson's use of proverbs and sententiae is of course readily comparable with Chaucer's, but the assumption of indebtedness should not be made.

Henryson's use of understatement, like his use of proverbs, is a feature of style which helps to give a "spoken" quality to the Fabillis. Frequently there is a telling use of understatement at some point of crisis in the narrative. In The Fox, the Wolf, and the Cadger, the cadger is planning revenge upon the fox who has stolen his fish by feigning death, when he sees the wolf lying down on the road, just as the fox had done: there follows the line "Bot giff he lichtit down, or nocht, God wait!" (2174). The same kind of effect is created by the reference to the wether's pursuit in The Wolf and the Wether - "Bot God wait gif the Wedder followit fast" (2517). In connection with this kind of device, Harvey Wood remarks that "Henryson's most Chaucerian gift, although it should be recognised as one distinctively Scottish, is his power of turning from pathos to humour, from the sublime to the ridiculous, in a line or phrase which breaks in upon the narrative like a spoken comment in the voice of the poet".⁴¹ The example which Wood provides is, however, surely more indicative of Scottishness than Chaucerianism. The poet's comment in The Two Mice - "Thay tareit nocht to wesche, as I suppoiss" - may belong to the same order of art as Chaucer's chat with the eagle in The House of Fame, as Wood suggests, but it is

even more closely allied to the art of these lines from

The Bruce:

He maid thame na gud fest, perfay,
And nocht for thi yneuch had thai.
For thouch thame failit of the met,
I warne yhow weill thai war weill wet. (XIV, 363-6)

(The passage describes the Irish king's attempt to drown Edward Bruce and his men.) This kind of understatement is one of Henryson's favourite forms of humour, and while he no doubt appreciated its occurrence in Chaucer's poetry, his own practice reflects a relish for one of the habits of his own spoken language. As for so many other features of his style, no assumption of specific indebtedness to Chaucer should be made.

There is validity in Elliott's claim that Henryson's style is Chaucerian inasmuch as it combines qualities such as wit, control, demand for the co-operation of the audience, and fluency of metre and diction,⁴² but it is essential to recognize that neither in The Cock and the Fox nor anywhere else in the Fabillis does he attempt to imitate Chaucer's style. As a way of describing Henryson's style, "Chaucerian" has a very limited usefulness, simply because there are so few correspondences of detail. No doubt Henryson's reading of Chaucer sharpened his awareness of the effectiveness of variations between one tone and level of language and another, but in this respect Chaucer is only one of a number of possible literary models, continental, English, and (not least) Scots. Alliteration is one of the most important aspects of Henryson's "fluency of metre and diction": it is used, for example, to intensify the

colloquial flavour of passages of dialogue, to make moralizing more emphatic, and, in the two "nature prologue" fables, to give vigour and sharpness to what might otherwise be fairly conventional descriptions of the natural world. The respect for the value of alliteration is one which Henryson shares with his fellow makars in Scotland rather than with Chaucer or Lydgate. The flexibility of Henryson's verse is also conditioned by the fact that like Chaucer, he was writing with the demands of performance in mind. This idea, presumably, underlies Kurt Wittig's comment that Henryson "assimilates Chaucer's conception of poetry and creates from this artistic centre".⁴³

Enough has been said in this chapter to show that there is very little in the Morall Fabillis, in terms of either subject matter or style, which can be identified with absolute certainty as borrowing from Chaucer. Before going on to discuss the relationship between Henryson's Fabillis and Lydgate's Isopes Fabules, some attention should be paid to a Scots fable which, unlike Henryson's work, does definitely indicate a considerable degree of indebtedness to Chaucer. Comparison between the style of The Unicorn's Tale, the third of The Tales of the Five Beasts (preserved in the Asloan MS)⁴⁴ and that of any one of Henryson's fables, is a valuable way of discriminating between what is Chaucerian and what is not. The Unicorn's Tale, which is a loose translation of part of the twelfth century Latin Speculum Stultorum by Nigel de Longchamps,⁴⁵ is related to Henryson's work by being an animal story followed by a moral

application. As in The Lion and the Mouse, the moralitas of the Tale is directed at those in authority (269-80). The story, to which there is an allusion in The Nun's Priest's Tale (3312-6), is of a cock who takes revenge on a boy who had broken his leg by throwing a stone: this takes the form of the cock's failure to wake the young man on the morning of his presentation to a rich benefice.

Like Chaucer's General Prologue and most of The Canterbury Tales which do not have a stanzaic form, The Unicorn's Tale is written in couplets, in lines which have a four stress pattern as their metrical norm. Some idea of the way in which the anonymous Scots poet has assimilated the manner of the Chaucerian narrator may be gained by setting his opening lines beside the beginning of The Summoner's Tale:

Before this tyme in Kentschire it befell,
A bonde thare was, his name I can nocht tell,
Gundulfus was his sonnis name I gess,
Of tender age of nyne yeris ald he wes..

Lordynges, ther is in Yorkshire, as I gesse,
A mersshie contree called Holdernesse,
In which ther wente a lymytour aboute,
To preche, and eek to begge, it is no doubte..

Apart from the similarity of rhythm and movement, there is a similar intimacy of tone, fostered by the use of first person tags such as "I gess". It is striking, too, that the Scots poet chooses to give his work an English setting: the Latin original is set in Apulia (1255). One might reasonably suppose that he intended his audience to connect the tale with The Canterbury Tales. Several details of The Unicorn's Tale show a clear Chaucerian influence. The first

of these is the emphasis placed on the adjective "litill" in the lines which relate the child's assault on the cock:

So on a day this litill prety child,
Seand thir birdis lukand our the wall
Toward the grangis Gundulfus gois withall,
And with the casting of a litill stone
Of ane litill bird the theis bone
Brokin he has... (142-7)

The repetition of this word, with its mock-bathetic effect, recalls Chaucer's use of "litel" in The Prioress's Tale (VII, 503, 509, 516, 552, 587), where it epitomizes the teller's fatuous involvement in her story of the "litel clergeon". In The Unicorn's Tale, as in Chaucer's poem, a delicate irony plays over the repetition: Gundulfus's vigilance, like the piety of the youthful St. Hugh, is strangely unchildlike. A similar kind of tongue-in-cheek humour pervades the account of Gundulfus as a young man:

He was na master of diuinite,
Bot he wald preche into that science hie.
Weile couth he cast the bukis of decess,
Bot tharin nothing had he of his greiss.
Prentiss in court he had bene for a yere,
He was a richt gud syngar in the quere.
He couth wele reid and sumpart write and dyte,
And in his grammere was he wele perfyte.
He was na gret bachillar in sophistry
With part of pratik of nygramansy. (177-86)

There are admittedly no close verbal parallels, but the tone of this passage suggests a lesson well-learned from the tone of The General Prologue. Like Chaucer, the Scots poet is a master of the art of gentle deflation. The details are different, but the method is that of the description of the Friar, who is "wantowne and merye" and at the same time "a ful solempne man". Gradually there emerges a picture of Gundulfus as one who is determined to pass as a learned man, although setting as much store by courtly as

by intellectual accomplishments. The poet successfully imitates the Chaucerian pose of a genial but shrewd reporter: like the "I" of The General Prologue he is both willing to applaud the social accomplishment and to suggest the moral implications of the deficiency in application. (The character's nearest Chaucerian relatives are the fastidious but negligent Friar and the Summoner, with his "fewe termes" of Latin "That he had learned out of som decree".) The lightness of touch, the apparent artlessness of the description, immediately call to mind the tone of Chaucer's pilgrim portraits. The seemingly indiscriminate use of the epithet "worthy" throughout The General Prologue ("This worthy lymytour"... "Was nowher swich a worthy vavasour") finds an appreciative echo in the line which relates the climax of the clerk's undignified scramble for preferment - "And in the myre this worthy clerk lay still" (252). It is possible, too, that the treatment of the cock in the Scots tale, which differs substantially from that of its original, owes something to the portrait of Chauntecleer in The Nun's Priest's Tale: both birds adopt an attitude of lordly condescension towards the counsel of their womenfolk.

The author of The Unicorn's Tale, who is by no means a slavish imitator of Chaucer, manages to recreate the style of The General Prologue and some of The Canterbury Tales much more successfully than Lydgate does in his awkward "sequel" to the Tales, The Siege of Thebes. The critic who sets out to find Chaucerianism in Scottish fable collections has a more fertile field to explore in The Unicorn's Tale

than in any of the Morall Fabillis. The style of this work - its form as a "frame" story, its rhythm, its particular brand of ingenuousness - is closer to Chaucer's manner than anything in Henryson apart from The Testament of Cresseid. As a continuation of The Canterbury Tales, the Scots poem is more authentic than the English essays in the Chaucerian manner - the prologues to Lydgate's The Siege of Thebes and to The Tale of Beryn, and The Pilgrim's Tale.

Although there is no case to be made for any extensive indebtedness on Henryson's part to Lydgate's Isopes Fabules, commentary on Henryson's sources has tended to underestimate a number of parallels between the English and the Scottish fable collections. The first of these applies to form. Lydgate's is a collection of seven fables, introduced by a general prologue which leads naturally into the fable of the cock and the jewel: in this Lydgate follows the verse Romulus or one of its derivatives. It is probable, as MacQueen suggests,⁴⁶ that the Prologue which Bassandyne prints as the introduction to the Morall Fabillis as a whole was originally intended by the poet to be both general and particular to The Cock and the Jasp, introducing a relatively small number of fables. It is impossible to tell exactly which fables, apart from The Cock and the Jasp, the prologue may have been intended to cover, but it is reasonable to assume that they would have been of the non-epic kind to which The Frog and the Mouse, The Two Mice, The Sheep and the Dog, and The Wolf and the Lamb belong. Bannatyne's grouping is suggestive here, although The Lion

and the Mouse, which comes after the other five fables, seems distinct from them because of its more elaborate form.⁴⁷ There is good reason to believe that Henryson originally intended part of what printed editions since Bassandyne have labelled as "The Morall Fabillis..." to stand independently as an Isopet, a similar kind of collection to Lydgate's Isopes Fabules. Moreover, it is possible that the inspiration for a "little Aesop" in English may have come from the Scots poet's reading of Lydgate. No proof can be offered for this theory, but it is worth drawing attention to the fact that four out of the five fables mentioned above - The Cock and the Jasp, The Frog and the Mouse, The Sheep and the Dog, and The Wolf and the Lamb - have counterparts in the English collection. The hypothesis that Henryson may have been inspired by Lydgate would of course not be worth considering if it were not for the existence of other parallels between the two.

Most of the verbal parallels which Plessow⁴⁸ and Gregory Smith⁴⁹ cite as evidence that Henryson borrowed from Lydgate are too general to be convincing, but there is one verbal similarity which is sufficiently close and sufficiently unusual to suggest that Henryson knew Lydgate's work and that he adapted one of its images. In the Prologue of Isopes Fabules there occurs this metaphorical account of the way in which "sentence" may be extracted from fable:

Vnder blak erpe byn precious stones founde,
 Ryche saphyres & charbuncles full ryall,
 And, who that myneb downe lowe in þe grounde,
Of gold & syluer groweb þe mynerall. (22-5)

The same idea is, of course, expressed in Henryson's Prologue by the image of the shell and the kernel, but a closer parallel with Lydgate's lines is to be found in the moralitas at the end of The Tod:

Rycht as the mynoure in his mynorall
 faire gold with fire may fra the lede wele win,
 rycht sa under a fable figurall
 a sad sentence may seke and efter fyn.. (st.99, 1-4)

Lydgate's use of "mynerall" is the first recorded in the OED, and the DOST indicates Henryson's "mynorall" to be the first in Middle Scots. Henryson's word does not have exactly the same meaning as Lydgate's ("mining works" rather than "mineral deposit"), but nevertheless it would appear that he did borrow from the English poem. There seems to be no source for the "mynorall" image in the French and Latin Aesopic collections upon which Henryson draws. The image in The Tod is more suggestive than Lydgate's, in the emphasis which it places on the skill involved in extracting the rich moral truth from the comparative dross of the enclosing narrative.

The emphasis in one of Henryson's moralitates is closer to Lydgate's treatment than to that of the continental version of the same fable. In The Wolf and the Lamb, Henryson inveighs against the rich and powerful wolves who oppress and exploit the poor and vulnerable lambs of society. In the version of Gualterus Anglicus, a simple contrast is drawn between the innocent and the guilty:

Sic nocet innocuo nocuus, causamque nocendi
 Inuenit. Hii regnant qualibet urbe lupi.⁵⁰

In Lydgate's fable of the wolf and the lamb, however, the

actors have the same significations as in the Scots fable. There is an affinity between the moralitates of the two versions of the sheep and the dog fable, but here Henryson's treatment seems to derive from the Isopet I rather than from Lydgate.⁵¹ David K. Crowne rightly draws attention to the resemblance between the moral applications of the two wolf and lamb fables, but it is difficult to understand his claim that "Further similarities appear when Henryson's The Cock and the Jewel, The Town Mouse and the Country Mouse, The Paddock and the Mouse, and The Wolf and the Lamb are set beside their counterparts in Lydgate".⁵² In terms of both narrative development and moral application, the fables of the cock and the jewel and the paddock and the mouse are very different from Lydgate's version, and a Lydgatian counterpart of The Two Mice simply does not exist.

The resemblances between Henryson's fables and Isopes Fabules, although relatively slight, do provide evidence that Henryson knew Lydgate's collection, although as in the case of the link between The Cock and the Fox and The Nun's Priest's Tale, the differences are much more interesting than the similarities. In general terms, Henryson's fables are much more vigorously narrated, reflecting a greater sense of intellectual and artistic control than the English ones. The differences may best be explained by concentrating on the two treatments of the wolf and the lamb fable, considering first the development and style of each narrative, then the relationship between tale and moralitas.

Lydgate's Tale of the Wolfe and the Lambe⁵³ begins with a series of commonplaces about the contraries which exist in Nature: vice is opposed to virtue, malice to innocence, fraud to truth, strength to weakness:

Ryght as atwene turment & delyces
 There ys in kynde a gret difference,
 Ryght so atwene vertues lyfe & vyces
 There may be no iust conuenience. (225-8)

There follow the exempla of sheep and lion, dwarf and champion, large and small fish, and finally, the wolf and the lamb. Here is late medieval verse moralizing at its worst, platitudinous and confused, since the poet fails to establish any meaningful connection between antithesis in "kynde" and the opposition between good and evil. The opening of Henryson's fable is much more direct: there are no moral generalizations, and the first few lines leave no doubt as to the human, moral opposition to be developed: the wolf is "cruell.. richt ravenous and fell", the "selie Lamb" is unsuspecting, "meik and Innocent". Lydgate devotes a whole stanza to explaining what the wolf signifies in human terms (253-9), before embarking upon the action. Lydgate's wolf makes his charges against the lamb uninterrupted, alleging that the latter is like his father, who also disturbed the wolf's drinking water. The lamb answers "with humbel reuerence", pointing out that water cannot flow uphill,

From þe hyll þe ryuer downe dyscendep
 For to ascende hit were ageyn nature.. (274-5)

but failing to mention the allegation about his father. His submissiveness is complete when he urges that the wolf must choose what is right (281-4), but this elicits only the further charge of flattery and the threat to take the

issue to law. The couplet which follows the wolf's second speech,

But he no lenger on þe lawe abood,
Deuouryd þe lambe & aftyr soke hys blood, (293-4)

explains with crude irony the value which the wolf places on legality. In Henryson's fable the dialogue between the two beasts is twice as long, and much more vivid. The wolf begins by accusing the lamb of polluting the stream with his "foull slavering" (2633). Although the victim, like Lydgate's lamb, quakes in fear (H. 2637; L. 287), he rallies immediately, protesting with rightful forensic indignation against the spuriousness of the wolf's claim:

Thocht I can nocht, Nature will me defend,
And off the deid perfyte experience;
All hevie thing man off the selff discend;
Bot giff sum thing on force mak resistance,
Than may the streme on na way mak ascence,
Nor ryn bakwart: I drank beneth yow far;
Ergo, ffor me your Bruke wes never the war. (2644-50)

Unlike Lydgate's character, the Scots lamb is able to put forward a two-point defence: not only is what the wolf alleges contrary to the laws of nature, but the lamb's lips are quite uncontaminated (2651-4). It is at this point in Henryson's poem that the wolf makes his accusation about the sins of the sheep. The lamb replies with spirit, this time quoting Scriptural authority ("Haiff ye not hard quhat halie Scripture sayis..?"), but the wolf can only intensify his claim to be revenged upon the "Successioun", alleging that the lamb's father spewed "strang poysoun" into his water. Again, the lamb counter-argues with reference to the law, pressing his right to have the case heard before "ane unsuspect Assyis" (2679-92). Having lost the rhetorical

contest with the lamb, the wolf abandons all pretence of just grievance, and admits that his desires have nothing to do with "ressoun":

The selie Lamb culd do na thing bot bleit;
Sone wes he deid: the Wolff wald do na grace,
Syne drank his blude, and off his flesche can eit,
Quhill he wes full, and went his way on pace. (2700-3)

Through the cut and thrust of the debate, the speciousness of the wolf's claim, and hence the imperviousness of malice to reasonable argument, are underlined. In this way Henryson's debate has a much greater intellectual appeal than the corresponding passage in Lydgate. Emotionally, too, Henryson's treatment is richer: instead of quietly submitting, the victim struggles against the oppressor until the end, first trying to appeal to reason, and only as a last resort pressing his right to a fair trial. This is a process which makes the disclosure of the naked reality of brute force much more vivid than it is in Lydgate's poem. Henryson's use of words is far superior to his predecessor's. The dramatic speeches are full of realistic details, and there is a successful imitation of the rhythms of actual speech within the confines of the metrical form. The language ranges from the formal and legalistic to the colloquial, and by comparison Lydgate's dialogue is stiff and mechanistic, devoid of the vigour and variety which make Henryson's miniature drama so memorable.

In the English fable, there follow after the story itself seven stanzas of moralization based upon the injury suffered by the lamb. Although there is nothing

intrinsically inappropriate about this approach, the passage suffers from intellectual and artistic flabbiness. The explanation of the lamb's literal value to man (309-12) lacks point, but the real weakness lies in Lydgate's circumlocution, in his unwillingness (or inability) to make his moralizing direct and easily intelligible. In the moralitas itself, the emphasis shifts away from temporal injustice to the question of divine reward and punishment: the "porayle", symbolised by the innocent lamb, will go to heaven, whereas wolf-like tyrants will be consigned to hell (337-50). At the end of Henryson's taill there is only a small passage of authorial comment, in the form of a series of rhetorical questions:

Of his murther quhat sall we say, allace?
 Wes not this reuth, wes not this grit pietie,
 To gar this selie Lamb but gilt thus de? (2704-6)

The moralitas which follows is just as coherently organized as the debate. It begins with a signification of wolf and lamb which is much more precise than Lydgate's. It goes on to categorize three kinds of "fals extortioneris/ And oppressouris of pure men", charging each group specifically:

O man of Law! let be thy subteltie.. (2721)

O man! but mercie, quhat is in thy thocht,
 War than ane Wolf, and thow culd understand? (2735-6)

O thow grit Lord, that riches hes and rent,
 Be nocht ane Wolf, thus to devoir the pure.. (2763-4)

When these lines are compared with the corresponding section of Lydgate's poem, it appears as though the Scots poet had set out quite deliberately to be clear and specific where Lydgate is diffuse and imprecise. One senses in Lydgate's allusion to the sheep who are clipped "pese dayes.... at

sessions & at shyres" (319-22) a desire to be specific and topical - this is as near as Lydgate ever comes to topical satire. Like his predecessor, Henryson puts the condemnation of injustice into the perspective of Divine Judgement, but the Scots prayer has much more immediacy. This is because it is more economically expressed, and also because it is so firmly localized in the present by the reference to the earthly king of Scotland:

And God, as thow all rychteous prayer heiris,
Mot saif our King, and gif him hart and hand
All sic Wolfis to banes out of the land. (2774-6)

It is obvious that in Henryson's fable, narrative is much more closely related to moralitas than in the English version, because attention is maintained throughout on the twin evils of injustice and oppression as they exist in a particular society.

The only lesson which Henryson might have learned from Lydgate's style is the negative one of what should be avoided rather than imitated. As a stylist, Lydgate is "loose, heavy-handed, and monotonous", where Henryson is "forceful, compact, and varied".⁵⁴ In the Fabules, as elsewhere in his verse, Lydgate shows an inability to follow Chaucer's example by enlivening his subject matter and teaching through variations in language and gradations of tone. Henryson is closer to Chaucer in this all-important respect, although the Scots poet's direct indebtedness to Chaucer is probably no greater than his indebtedness to Lydgate for a few narrative details and points of moral emphasis. The urge to extract overt "moralitee" from nearly

every turn of the narrative renders Lydgate's fables lifeless, and the moralizings themselves are for the most part tiresomely commonplace. As an expositor of the kernel of moral truth contained within the shell of his fables, Henryson is infinitely more forceful. His moralitates are sometimes intellectually ingenious, but even where this kind of strenuousness is absent (as in The Wolf and the Lamb), the exhortations to righteousness and the condemnations of vice are direct, incisive, and devoid of complacency.

Of the three English groups of fable material discussed in this chapter, Henryson seems to have made more practical use of the two prose collections which were nearer in time to his own writing than either The Nun's Priest's Tale or Isopes Fabules. The major aspects of Henryson's indebtedness to Caxton's Reynard and Aesop have been convincingly argued by Crowne⁵⁵ and MacQueen⁵⁶, who extend the earlier discussions of the subject by Diebler⁵⁷ and Gregory Smith.⁵⁸ Correspondences of narrative detail between Henryson's work and Caxton's establish that at least two of the Fabillis, The Fox and the Wolf and The Trial of the Fox (parts II and III of The Tod) show the influence of parts of Caxton's Reynard, published in 1481, and that another two, The Wolf and the Wether and The Fox, the Wolf, and the Husbandman, show the influence of Caxton's Aesop and may therefore be dated after 1484. (MacQueen tentatively adds The Fox, the Wolf and the Cadger to this group.)⁵⁹ It would be superfluous to list here the details which Henryson has adapted

from Caxton's treatment of the relevant fables, and the aim of the following paragraphs is to show that Denton Fox's "answer" to the arguments for Henryson's use of Caxton is seriously misleading. Fox is quite emphatic that "there is no good proof that Henryson had any knowledge of Caxton's Reynard or Aesop".⁶⁰ He states that the reasoning behind the arguments mentioned above is that those fables which have no points of contact with Caxton's work should be dated before 1481, "on the assumption that Caxton's books had such an overpowering effect on Henryson that he was unable, after reading them, to write anything which was not to some degree Caxtonized".⁶¹ Although Crowne does appear to follow this reasoning,⁶² MacQueen does not, and his hypothesis that the group of fables anthologized by Bannatyne is earlier than the others depends rather upon their Isopet form than upon any relationship to Caxton.⁶³ It is absurd to imagine that Henryson felt an obligation to borrow from Caxton, and the fact that Fox misrepresents part of the argument he attacks makes caution about his own claims necessary.

Fox argues against the indebtedness of The Fox and the Wolf to Reynard, Ch.XXVII, on the grounds that the name "Waitskaith", which Henryson and Caxton both use, is borrowed from Colkelbie Sow, where it is given to the cowherd who "dansit ane dandy" (I, 272). It seems more likely, however, that the author of Colkelbie Sow has taken the name from Henryson. Dunbar and Douglas, both of whom may be assumed to have written after Henryson, refer to this poem, whereas

apart from the name "Waitksaith" there is nothing to connect Henryson's poetry with Colkelbie. The fact that the character who has the name is in both Henryson and Caxton a cleric rather than a cowherd suggests that the adaptation has been made by the Colkelbie poet. In the same chapter of Reynard there is a wolf in the guise of a cleric, and MacQueen suggests that this figure provided the inspiration for Henryson's wolf-friar.⁶⁴ Fox argues that the idea may equally well have come from Odo of Cheriton,⁶⁵ but the combination in The Fox and the Wolf of two details in the same part of Reynard is surely decisive for Caxton's influence.

The clustering of a much larger number of parallels between The Trial of the Fox and Reynard is a clear indication that Henryson used Caxton as a source, as MacQueen explains.⁶⁶ By themselves, a few of these are striking enough to suggest borrowing, and the combination amounts to nothing less than proof. Fox sets out to show that there are other possible sources for Henryson's details, thereby overlooking the crucial fact of their co-existence in both works. At least two of the alternative sources which he suggests for particular details are further removed from Henryson than are the corresponding parts of Reynard. The suggested source for the fox's taunt about the wolf's bleeding head,

Than Lourance said, "My lord, spere nocht at me.
This new maid Doctour of Divinitee
with his rede cap can tell you wele yneuch." (92,4-6)

is a joke by the fox in the Roman de Renart,⁶⁷

De quele ordre volez vos estre
qui rouge chaperon avez?

MacQueen cites three instances in Reynard of the jest about clerics and broken heads, two of which (in Chs. XXII and XXIV) are much closer to Henryson than to the Roman:

"My lord," said I, "that has done this priest that sits here with a bloody crown.."

"See, my lord the king, thus got he his red coif."⁶⁸

In Henryson, as in Caxton, much of the humour derives from the fact that the wounded cleric is mocked in the presence of his ruler. The joke in the Roman, which is not the same joke in any case, lacks this dramatic context, and so it seems more probable that Henryson's source here is Caxton. Fox suggests also that the detail of the one animal who fails to attend the lion's parliament is borrowed from an exemplum by Odo of Cheriton, rather than from Reynard, Ch.XIIII, where the absent animal is a fox.⁶⁹ There is no good reason, though, why Odo's ass should be felt to be any closer than Caxton's fox to Henryson's "gray stude meir". Fox conveniently omits to mention that there is no source other than Reynard, Ch.XXVII, for the detail of the wolf being kicked in the head by a wily mare. The correspondence is strengthened by the existence of a verbal parallel to Henryson's "I can nocht spell a word, sa God me speid".⁷⁰ The other parallels discussed by MacQueen - the name of the lion, the treatment of the natural setting, and the taunt "The grettest clerkis ar nocht the wisest men" - reinforce what is so clearly indicated by the parallels mentioned above, that Henryson did draw upon various parts of Reynard for the development of the narrative in The Trial of

the Fox.

The parallels between The Wolf and the Wether and Caxton's handling of the fable (Aesop V, 15) are just as significant, despite Fox's arguments to the contrary. He suggests, for example, that Henryson's agreement with Caxton in omitting the detail of the wether's dehorning would be more forceful if Henryson had not omitted other preliminary details which Caxton includes,⁷¹ but this begs the question of Henryson's licence to alter his source material in the interests of narrative economy. In Henryson's story, as in Caxton's, the wolf takes the wether to only one of the dungheaps, whereas in Steinhöwel's version and its Latin original the unfortunate wether is made to visit all three.⁷² Fox suggests that it would have been natural for Henryson to avoid "this awkward guided tour",⁷³ but does not explain why. As Jamieson points out, the most important resemblance between Henryson and Caxton is the description of the sheep as a wether, where in the other versions he is a ram. Curiously, Fox states that this "does not seem conclusive because 'wether', in Middle Scots, has the sense 'ram' (see OED, s.v.)".⁷⁴ The OED citation to which Fox refers is from the Bruce, - "And ane of thame apon his hals/ A mekill bundyn weddir bare" (VII, 114-5) - where the context leaves no doubt that "weddir" has its modern meaning. None of the citations in the DOST support Fox's suggestion of ambiguity.⁷⁵

MacQueen, Jamieson, and Crowne all suggest that there

is a direct link between Caxton's Aesop⁷⁶ and The Fox, the Wolf and the Husbandman.⁷⁷ Caxton uses "shadow" in the sense "reflection of a bright object" rather than to mean simply "reflection", and so too does Henryson in the line "The schadow of the Mone schone in the well" (2392). Fox states that this is nothing more than Henryson's usual term for "reflection", but the context does suggest the more restricted meaning. He objects too to the suggestion that Henryson follows Caxton by repeating the taunt about Fortune's buckets - "thus fairis it off Fortoun:/ As ane cummis up, scho quheillis ane uther down" (2419) - on the grounds that the expression was probably proverbial, and traditionally associated with the fable.⁷⁸ But in the absence of more evidence for this hypothesis than Fox is able to provide, it must be concluded that the similarity of both verbal and narrative detail does in fact reflect Henryson's knowledge of Aesop.

I have referred to Fox's article in some detail in order to show that the arguments which it advances are generally inconclusive, and that there is in fact positive evidence that Henryson knew and used both Reynard and Aesop. The connections between Caxton's work and Henryson's are usually less ambiguous than those between The Nun's Priest's Tale and The Cock and the Fox because they are closer together in time, and because there is not the same kind of evidence for lost versions of the fables concerned. It is hardly surprising that Henryson uses Caxton's fables in much the same way as he seems to use the work of Chaucer and

Lydgate. From Caxton's perfunctory narratives Henryson takes a number of interesting details, placing each in a context of his own devising, and subordinating each to his own infinitely richer style of expression.

There is no English poetry of the late fifteenth century - fable collection or otherwise - which approaches the combination of stylistic variety, humour, moral vigour, and intellectual control illustrated by the Fabillis. Since the Testament was discovered and anglicized comparatively early by an English publisher, it may appear strange that the Fabillis were not printed in England until 1577. Perhaps one of the reasons for their late appearance in the south is their uncompromising Scottishness: it is understandable that the Testament could be received as the work of Chaucer, but no translator, however ingenious, could disguise the origins of the northern Aesop. One thinks immediately of their distinctively Scots legal vocabulary, and to the allusions to socio-political institutions and circumstances in Scotland. Richard Smith completed his translation "in the Vale of Aylesburie the thirteenth of August 1574", and it was printed in London in 1577 as The Fabulous tales of Esope the Phrygian, Compiled moste eloquently in Scottische Metre by Master Robert Henrison, & now lately Englished.⁷⁹ (Harvey Wood suggests that Smith may have worked from an earlier printed text, the origin of both the Bassandyne print and the Harleian MS.)⁸⁰ In his dedication to Stonely (an official of the Exchequer), Smith conjectures that political prejudices have been responsible

for the neglect of the Scots work:

But whether most men haue that nation in derision for
their hollowe hearts and vngratefull mindes to this
countrey alwayes had (a people verie subiect to that
infection) or thinking scorne of the Authour or first
inuention let it passe..

Despite his nationalism and his many shortcomings as a translator, Smith was sensitive enough to recognize the value of Henryson's work, "verie eloquent and full of great inuention". The translation is prefaced by a dialogue between "Aesop" and Smith in St. Paul's churchyard, and the model for this is Henryson's own Prologue to The Lion and the Mouse. Aesop, who is "Apparalled both braue and fine,/ After the Scottish guise", requests to meet someone who would teach him "to speake English". Smith protests that his abilities are merely those of the servant of Pan who plays an "oaten pipe", and he tries to direct the northern visitor first to "the Innes of Court and Chaucery/ where learned haue to do", and then to the poets who employ an elegant lyric style. Henryson-Aesop will have none of this, preferring to entrust his work to one whose style is unpretentious. He laments the fact that readers of poetry (by implication, English readers) have no time for the work of northern poets:

"They do not care for Scottish bookes,
They list not looke that way:
But if they would but cast their lookes
Some time when they do play,
Somewhat to see perhaps they might
That then would like them wel,
To teach them treade thair way aright
To blisse, from paines of hel."

The printer replies that he can tarry no longer:

"If not", sayth Esope, "then adew,
Into Scotland I'le retorne".

Although it is itself of little literary value, the dialogue is of interest because it provides one of the few sixteenth century English comments on Scottish literature. Smith goes so far as to suggest that Henryson's work is superior to some of the English poetry of his day: he is not specific, but it is tempting to believe that after printing verse so attenuated and derivative as George Gascoigne's Posies and The Steel Glas, Smith turned to Henryson's Fabillis feeling something akin to relief. Henryson's work was known to at least one English reader before Smith's edition: there is good reason to believe that The Two Mice is a source for one of Thomas Wyatt's Satires.⁸¹

Chapter V

The Palace of Honour as commentary on The House of Fame.

In The Palice of Honour, Douglas represents himself as one of the Muses' "Court Rethoricall", that illustrious company of European poets, classical, medieval, and modern, whose abilities befit them to make the journey to the glorious court of Honour. Like Henryson's Fabillis, Douglas's dream vision is the product of a familiarity with European as well as English poetry. The value which Douglas places upon his membership of the great tradition is enacted by the style and subject matter of The Palice: its most recent editor observes that the poem "is remarkable both for its wealth of literary allusion and for the way in which almost every theme or episode has some precedent in earlier medieval poetry".¹ At one level, The Palice is a summa of nearly two centuries of writing in the genre of the vision allegory, and it is probable that one of Douglas's reasons for writing it was to demonstrate his familiarity with all aspects of the tradition instigated by the Roman de la Rose. The various gardens in which the poet finds himself, the processions or "triumphs" which recur throughout the vision, the guide who accompanies the poet, the grundmotif of the journey, the catalogues of famous personages, and the elaborate descriptions of allegorical landscapes and architecture, all have counterparts in earlier poetry. The very comprehensiveness of The Palice - the combination of so many conventions in a single poem - assist to make it such an attractive example of its genre.

In this chapter my concern is to examine one aspect of Douglas's traditionalism - the use which he makes of

English poetry, and in particular the poetry of Chaucer. I recognize, as Priscilla Bawcutt does, that there is no single source for the poem as a whole, and that an attempt to find one would indicate an unwarrantable disregard of its tone of confident eclecticism. The inherited literary material from which Douglas selects and adapts includes not only the work of Chaucer and Lydgate, but also the Roman de la Rose and some of the French love-allegories in the Rose tradition (e.g., poems by Deschamps, Machaut, de Condé, Froissart, de Saint Gelais), Petrarch's Trionfi,² Scots poetry, and the Latin classics. In her résumé of the continental background, Mrs Bawcutt is unable to trace any close, sustained parallels with The Palice, and this shows how successfully Douglas has assimilated his literary heritage. Reviewing the STS edition, Lois Ebin alleges that Bawcutt "strains to find remote and tenuous sources .. while overlooking more immediate influences",³ such as Chaucer's dream visions, and in particular The Hous of Fame. The charge has some foundation, although the nature of Dr. Ebin's article permits no elaboration. In the following paragraphs an attempt will be made to show that although there are no extensive passages of verbal borrowing from Chaucer, The Palice of Honour may be read as a commentary upon The Hous of Fame, one which involves a reinterpretation of Chaucer's moral and thematic emphases, and an adaptation of some of his stylistic devices. It would be misguided to suggest that Chaucer's poem is the single source of The Palice of Honour, but the resemblances between the two poems are sufficiently close to indicate

that Douglas had the English work in mind as he wrote.

Several critics have drawn attention to similarities of narrative detail and style between them. In a thorough but little-read early study, P. Lange draws attention to parallels between The Hous of Fame and The Palice to illustrate his view that "Die ganze art der erfindung und ausführung des Palice of Honour bewegt sich völlig im stil und im charakter der allegorischen poesie Chaucer's".⁴

(Rightly, he goes beyond The Hous of Fame to other Chaucerian visions: the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women is particularly important as the source of one episode in The Palice.) Denton Fox reiterates several of the resemblances between the two poems mentioned by Lange: for example, the sudden translation of the poet-dreamer in each to a desert, the guide, the appearance of the other-worldly abode, the nature of the journey's climax, the characteristics of the poet-figure.⁵ On the basis of these and other parallels, Fox describes Douglas's poem as "a very useful commentary on 'The Hous of Fame'".⁶ Although this is exactly my own view of the relationship between the two poems, I do not think that Fox makes a sufficiently convincing case. In themselves such parallels, however interesting, illustrate only a knowledge of Chaucer's work, and it is too much to claim that either singly or together they constitute a critical commentary of the later work upon the earlier. All that can be said is that they exist as part of a commentary on The Hous of Fame, one which has its foundation in the difference between the concepts of Honour and Fame.

Chaucer's poem is unfinished and in some respects incoherent, but it is clear at least that it is an investigation of the question posed by the poet in Book III: "What may ever laste?" (1147). The portrait in the "lytel laste bok" of the arbitrary, ever-changing goddess, the account of the companies who plead with her, and the close connection between Fame and capricious Rumour all suggest a profound dissatisfaction with the goal of personal Fame or Renown. The key to Douglas's commentary upon the central moral question of The Hous of Fame is the careful distinction between Fame and Honour which is elaborated in his final book. Calliope's nymph explains that in the realm of Honour even the most powerful temporal rulers,

Allanerlie sall for vertew honourit be.
For eirdlie gloir is nocht bot vanitie
That as we se sa suddanelie will wend,
Bot vertuous Honour neuer mair sall end. (1977-80)

The hollowness of Fame as a goal is further underlined by the nymph's explanation that when rulers die all that may remain is "fame of thair Estaitis", and that nothing but "verteous warkis" may accompany them after death - "Ay vertew ringis in lestand Honour cleir" (1990-98). The definition of Honour reads almost as an answer to the question "What may ever laste?" Chaucer's poem exposes the transitory nature of temporal fame, just as Philosophy does in the Consolation:

Bot yow men semeth to geten yow a perdurablete, whan
ye thynken that in tyme comynge your fame schal last-
en. But natheles yif thow wolt maken comparysoun to
the endles spaces of eternyte, what thyng hastow by
which thow mayst rejoisen the of long lastynge of
thi name? (Chaucer's translation, Bk. II, Pr. 7,
90-96)

Unlike Douglas or Boethius, Chaucer makes no mention in his poem of any eternal verity, the equivalent of Honour or the Boethian God, which regulates and circumscribes worldly renown. Individual virtue is a necessary condition of residence in the Palace of Honour: mere whim and accident, on the other hand, explain in Chaucer's poem the fame of all but the great writers.

The whole of Chaucer's Book III produces an effect of anticlimax, probably intentional. The portentous rhetorical preliminaries and the eagle's promises of enlightening experience create the expectation that something of exceptional moment is to be revealed when the destination is reached. The material splendours of Fame's abode and the bizarre demeanour of the goddess herself are not sufficient to fulfil the promises which have been made in the earlier books. It is not only the audience, but also the poet-dreamer, who feels cheated. To the unnamed interlocutor in the house of Fame, the poet complains that the journey has been of very limited educational value:

For wel y wiste ever yit,
Sith that first y hadde wit,
That somme folk han desired fame
Diversly, and loos, and name. (1897-900)

Chaucer gives no clue as to the identity of the "man of gret auctorite" whom he sees later in the house of Rumour, but it is possible that this is some figure who is to make a definitive pronouncement about the significance of the allegorical court. Douglas provides a critical comment on The Hous of Fame by setting an explicit and conclusive

affirmation of value against Chaucer's uninspired account of misdirected striving. Where Chaucer leaves his audience to draw their own conclusions about the delusive quality of temporal fame, Douglas makes an unequivocal statement about the proper goal of human endeavour. His Honour cannot be attained without the exercise of the Christian virtues and responsibilities, as the account of the Prince's allegorical household (1791-827) makes clear. This account must have had special force for the contemporary audience, since the court of Honour has a literal model in the Scots royal household: modern criticism has been slow to recognize that here Douglas is holding up a speculum to James IV,

His Comptrollar is cleipit Discretioun.

Humanitie and trew Relatioun

Bene Ischaris of his Chalmer morne and ewin. (1801-03)

The Christian significance of Honour is further underlined by the deity's power to condemn those who are without virtue. It is surely not difficult to accept that Douglas is looking back to Chaucer's poem, reinterpreting its "sentence" by replacing Chaucer's indirectness and unwillingness to put his subject matter into a religious perspective with a strong affirmation of the value which "neuer mair sall end". Since the poem contains no specific mention of The Hous of Fame (there is only the general reference to "Geffray Chauceir, as A per se sans peir/ In his vulgare"), it is not possible to state that Douglas intended his audience to appreciate the allusion to the English poem and to observe how different are the ethical concepts embodied in the ends of the two dream journeys. It is, however, quite likely that the association was intended to be

recognized, since Chaucer's poem was known in Scotland. Since the subject matter and the style of The Palice show the influence of The Hous of Fame at several points, it seems improbable that the suggestive opposition of Fame to Honour is simply fortuitous. Although pertinent, Fox's comment is unnecessarily hesitant about the directness of the thematic connection between Douglas's poem and Chaucer's:

The difference [between the concepts of Honour and Fame] is neatly symbolised by the hills the buildings are on: both hills appear to be made of glass, but where Chaucer's turns out to be of ice, Douglas's is of hard marble, and so equally hard to climb but infinitely more durable. Chaucer emphasises the arbitrariness of earthly fame and, with his revolving wicker house, gives an image of mutability. Douglas's honour is supernatural, just and eternal... and so is contrasted with earthly mutability.⁷

Bawcutt, observing that "the total effect of the two poems is quite dissimilar, and the Douglas's Honour is a strikingly different personification from Chaucer's Fame, which is shifting and unstable",⁸ does not allow for the later poet's use of Chaucer as a point of departure.

Douglas's demonstration of the superiority of "lestand" Honour over ephemeral Fame carries with it an important statement about the value of poetic composition. Like The Hous of Fame, The Palice of Honour explores the theme of the poet's vocation, and this similarity, combined with the discussion of Honour vs. Fame, offers evidence of Douglas's borrowing from Chaucer. The two works are unique among late medieval dream vision literature, English and continental alike, in offering extended commentaries upon the

poet's vocation within the framework of the dream vision, and it is this which chiefly distinguishes the Scots work from the various French "Honneur" poems mentioned by Bawcutt.⁹ In The Hous of Fame the raison d'être of the dream journey is the education of the poet - not primarily, as in the Roman de la Rose, Piers Plowman, and The Kingis Quair, in some aspect of right living and loving, but in the much more specific terms of his vocation as a literary artist. The loquacious eagle explains to the astonished "Geffrey" that Jupiter has decided to reward him because he has through his art - "bookys, songes, dytees,/ In ryme, or elles in cadence" - praised the "art" of the God of Love (606-28). The reward takes the form of the knowledge to be gained by experience, as opposed to the knowledge to be won from books. For the eagle, as presumably for his master, the "daswed" demeanour of the poet is a subject for laughter (655-60). This experience is not to be one of actual involvement in the complex realities of love ("Although thou maist goo in the dance/ Of hem that hym lyst not avaunce"), but rather one of observing both the tangles in which "Loves folk" exist (672-98), and the nature of the goddess Fame. The poet-dreamer, and indirectly his audience, have been prepared for the close association of Love and Fame through the telling of the Dido-Aeneas story in the previous Book. It is implied by the eagle's promises during the journey that the experience of observing living people in the house of Fame will be different in kind from that of observing the static mural decorations in the temple of Venus. Jove's emissary does

not actually say, as Africanus does in The Parlement of Foules, "I shal the shewe mater of to wryte", but throughout the second and third books runs the suggestion that the experience of visiting Fame's abode is to provide the stimulus for new poetry.

Since in Chaucer's poem there is no question of the poet's being enlisted in the active service of the Goddess of Love, the experience can have no meaning outside the context of his vocation. This is illustrated very clearly by his unequivocal denial of interest in personal fame: asked if he has "come hider to han fame", he replies,

I cam noght hyder, graunt mercy,
For no such cause, by my hed!
Sufficeth me, as I were ded,
That no wight have my name in honde.
I wot myself best how y stonde;
For what I drye, or what I thynke,
I wil myselven al hyt drynke,
Certeyn, for the more part,
As fer forth as I kan myn art. (1874-82)

Despite the obscurity of the syntax of the last two lines it is clear that a contrast is being drawn "between the personal mortality of the man and the potential durability of that part of his experience and intelligence ... which he can convert into poetry".¹⁰ Personal fame is dismissed as a goal: the poet's art offers his only hope of immortality. J.A.W. Bennett explains that the statuesque figures in the house of Fame do not occupy their positions as the result of any personal ambitions:

Chaucer's literary personages, who had promoted the fame of others rather than of themselves, and who are not victims of vanity, stand erect and exalted; but they too bear burdens on their shoulders - the subjects of their histories and poems.¹¹

The poets and historians whose "hy and gret sentence" is immortalized in metal are remote and inaccessible figures, and the living visitor makes no presumption to be a member of their company. Nevertheless, a clear endorsement of the values which they represent is made, not only by the personal credo quoted above, but also by the placing of the poet-descriptions immediately before the account of Fame's ponderous and arbitrary levee. The various difficulties in the way of attaining a lasting fame through the exercise of poetic abilities are alluded to, both explicitly and implicitly, throughout the poem. This is the prime function of the rhetorical preliminaries - proems and invocations - which have a more prominent role in The Hous of Fame than in any other poem by Chaucer. The Proem to Book I, for example, raises the question of the reliability of dreams, the various sub-categories of that phenomenon which medieval convention defined as one of the most important ways in which a poet could apprehend the truth. In the Invocation which follows, Chaucer raises first the problem of telling "aryght", of fixing his insights in words so that their meaning is accurately conveyed to the audience, and then his fear that his meaning may be wilfully misrepresented by others. Other passages raise the issues of accurate recollection (Proem, Book II), and of reconciling truth ("sentence") with the manner of its expression (Invocation, Book III). The fact that Chaucer chooses to give such prominence to creative problems indicates that he had given each of them serious consideration, and that he wished his audience to understand something of the process by which a

poem is made. Humour does not stand in the way of this serious purpose, although in the absence of the poet's physical presence as speaker it is well-nigh impossible to interpret the fluctuations of tone throughout these passages of direct address. The disposition of the poem's parts raises the further question of the value of authority, the legacy of the literary past, to the poet. By the middle of Book III, we become aware that the itinerant poet has learned just the same simple truth from his reading (represented allegorically by what he sees in the temple of Venus) as he learns from his spectacular flight and the sights of Fame's dwelling.¹²

The questions about poetic composition which are raised by The Palice of Honour are not always the same as those raised by The Hous of Fame, and the details of Douglas's dream narrative are different in many respects. It would of course be surprising if the position were otherwise, given Douglas's invention and his prominence in a separate literary tradition. Taken together, however, the similarities between the English and the Scots "poet's poems" reveal Douglas's indebtedness. At the core of the human drama in The Palice of Honour is the issue of the poet's allegiance, and in the development of this theme several interesting adaptations from The Hous of Fame are made. Reconciliation of the poet's vocation with his allegiance to the demanding goddess of Love is a Chaucerian theme which Douglas expands to accord with his own thematic ends. The Prologue to The Legend of Good Women and The

Hous of Fame are both important here, and attention will be given later to Douglas's use of the Prologue. In The Palice, as in The Hous of Fame, detachment from the physical service of Venus - love "in dede" - is shown to be necessary for the writing of poetry. Chaucer gives two hints at the nature of the unhappiness which precedes his vision: the first is the allusion to the "corseynt Leonard", the patron of captives, hence appropriately remembered by one disenchanted with matrimony;¹³ the second is the eagle's sympathetic reference to the poet's heart-suffering (2014-18). Within the narrative of the dream, there are clear indications of the value which is placed upon love. Describing the temple of Venus, the dreamer is quick to make his allegiance plain. The goddess is addressed as "my lady dere" (213), and a brief prayer is later offered to her (465-7). There is more than conventional mock-modesty about his refusal to speak of the sensual pleasures of love - "I kan not of that faculte." Although, as always, he is ready to permit a joke at his own expense, Chaucer makes the serious point that a total dedication to Love, for himself at least, is not compatible with poetic endeavours. This point is clearly made, again humorously, in the eagle's account of the poet's exhausting nightly labours over his books. The self-distancing from love is closely akin to his aloofness from Fame. The message that art demands a voluntary restraint from mundane pursuits such as physical satisfaction and the quest for renown is sounded very clearly in the line "I wot myself best how y stonde."

The subject of the relation between the poet and Venus is explored at greater length in The Palice of Honour, yet the conclusions reached are very similar to the kind of reconciliation which is implied in The Hous of Fame. The elaborate garden Prologue introduces the dilemma of the poet who is uncertain about what his "obseruance" should be: hearing the beautiful hymn to Love, he cries out for guidance,

"O Nature quene and O ze lusty May"
 Quod I tho, "quhow lang sall I thus foruay?
 Quhilk zow and Venus in this garth deseruis,
 Reconsell me out of this gret affray
 That I maye synge zow laudis day be day." (91-5)

(I have followed the London text here, because it gives a superior reading.) G. Kinneavy, who discusses the matter of the poet's development within the poem, provides no justification for his statement that the "'obseruance' ... is clearly not to be seen as relative to the usual love matters of the May setting".¹⁴ He is overcome by "dreidfull terrour", and this change in mood is represented in the forceful literal terms of the desert, the verbal equivalent of one of Bosch's interior landscapes. The desert represents not simply the poet's disordered, and to this extent unnatural, state of mind: it is also the emblem of the poet's world when art has been removed from it. He responds to the natural world of May as both living entity and precious artifact, in which the flowers are described as precious stones, the leaves as "natures Tapestreis", and the dew as "siluer droppis". The uncertainty about his own function in the scene, induced by the lover's song, destroys his sense of harmony between art and nature,

and precipitation into the desert - a world without order, symmetry, and natural life - is the consequence. Douglas extends and amplifies the conclusion of Book I of The Hous of Fame, where Chaucer too describes a world devoid of art in terms of a wasteland. Going outside the rich and elaborate temple of Venus, in which real and universal problems are fixed in the stasis of art, the dreamer finds himself in a desert - "Withouten toun, or hous, or tree,/ Or bush, or grass, or eryd land.." (484-5). Douglas takes over the image of the desert, heightening its details and incorporating it into a scheme of contrasting moral-aesthetic landscapes. Interpretation of the desert scenes in the two poems in this way, as part of developing arguments about the value of art, gives them a significance which is deeper than that observed by Fox:

In both poems, this desert stands for the desolate and barren spiritual condition of the narrator, caught in the wastes of the temporal world, and is equivalent to Dante's selva oscura or Eliot's wasteland..¹⁵

That the poet in The Palice of Honour regards himself less as the servant of Venus than as the servant of poetry is clearly implied by the excitement which he experiences at the sight of the Muses' court:

The suddane sight of that firme Court foirsaid
Recomfort weill my hew, befoir was faid.
Amid my spreit the Ioyous heit redoundit,
Behalding how the lustie Musis raid
And all thair Court, quhilk was sa blyith and glaid,
Quhais merines all heuines confoundit. (889-94)

We have already seen how in The Hous of Fame Chaucer dramatizes his allegiance to literary art by juxtaposing the

account of the orderly poets' gallery against the unstable pageant enacted before the throne of Fame. Douglas's details are obviously quite different, but the technique - implying the priority of one company over another - is essentially the same as Chaucer's.

Douglas achieves a very similar reconciliation between a commitment to Love and a commitment to Art to that which is implied in The Hous of Fame. The problem of his duty to Venus is solved by the pact which is made after the intercession of Calliope and her court. He is to serve Venus not as a lover, but as a poet: this is demonstrated by the second lay which he sings in her presence (1015-44), and by his promise to accept her "nixt ressonabill command", which proves to be translation of the Aeneid. It is surely no coincidence that Douglas and Chaucer choose the same work, in which Venus's son is hero, to be the focus of their vocational allegiance to Love. Other factors doubtless helped to shape Douglas's decision to translate the Aeneid, but the example of Chaucer as an interpreter of Virgil - relating the story of Dido in both The Hous of Fame and The Legend of Good Women - must not be overlooked.

In both poems, poetic allegiance to Venus is closely linked with demonstration of the traditional basis of poetic art: this is one of the most interesting examples of the Scots poet's borrowing from Chaucer. The dreamer in The Hous of Fame finds himself first in the temple of Venus, where he reads the opening lines of Virgil's great

epic "written on a table of bras" (141-8), accompanied by a series of illustrations of the story. The poetry of the past is to be admired not least for its formal setting and for its craft (represented in the poem by the elaborate "olde werk" of the architectural surround): the very stability of the literature of the past gives the modern poet warrant to reinterpret its stories, themes and techniques. The telling of the Dido-Aeneas story in Book I is thus an extended illustration of the famous "olde felde .. newe corn" metaphor in The Parlement of Foules (22-5). The equivalent to the temple of Venus episode in The Palice of Honour is the account of Venus's mirror, which critics, not appreciating its full significance, have tended to dismiss as an over-long digression.¹⁶ At his destination of the palace of Honour, the poet encounters Venus for the second time, and he devotes twenty-eight stanzas to telling what he saw in the mirror before her throne (1468-728). Calliope's nymph is ironically matter-of-fact about this "royall Relick", saying only that it reflects what the beholder wishes to see, that it "Signifyis na thing ellis to vnderstand/ Bot the greit bewtie of thir Ladyis facis,/ Quhairin louers thinks thay behald all graces" (1762-4). The implication is that the poet of Venus has a superior and wider-reaching power of observation. He sees the whole range of human experience preserved by written authority. Biblical history, pagan epic and legend, and more modern records - "All plesand pastance and gammis that nicht be" - are present to his sight and ready for him to draw upon. Significantly Douglas, like his English predecessor, devotes

a section to paraphrase of the Aeneid, and soon afterwards Venus presents him with the commission of translating it. The mirror itself illustrates what is meant by the earlier description of poetry as "Ioyous discipline,/ Quhilk causes folk thair purpois to expres/ In ornate wise" (846-8). The delightful variety of matter which it reflects is shaped and disciplined by the circular "bordour" of ornate decoration. In a similar way, the "ymages" from the Aeneid which the dreamer beholds in The Hous of Fame are contained and illuminated by the richly formal setting of the temple. The second (related) meaning of the mirror episode is hinted at by the command of Calliope's nymph, which precedes it - "Quhat now thow seis, luik efterwart thow write" (1464). Just as lovers are restored after "the Tornament" by beholding the faces of their ladies, so too is the poet strengthened and inspired by his contact with books. The evidence provided by a close reading of the poem enables an affirmative answer to be given to the question posed so tentatively by Kinneavy:

Is it possible that the vision presented to him in Venus' mirror is but a visual mode of describing the poet's own imaginative faculty as also restored or made "haill"?¹⁷

The theme of rejuvenation through contact with past literature is not developed to the same extent in The Hous of Fame.

To the extent that Chaucer's dream journey from the temple of Venus is shown to provide the poet with a very limited amount of new knowledge about literature or life,

The Hous of Fame is an inversion or parody of the conventional vision poem. Its serious meaning emerges from the poet's comments on his "matere", and from passages of reported speech: the statement about the priority of literary endeavour over the quest for either love or fame is presented in this way. Although the end of the journey is something of an anticlimax, Chaucer uses the motif of the poet's travels to develop other ideas about poetry and poetic composition. Douglas does not follow Chaucer in giving his own poem an ending which contradicts the promise of the earlier books, but the issues of Love vs. Poetry and the importance of literary tradition are not the only themes which are developed from The Hous of Fame. The comic potential of the aerial journey in Book II of Chaucer's poem is exploited to the full, with Chaucer making capital out of his unfitness and his reluctance to be carried aloft. Interwoven with the dramatic comedy of the eagle's verbosity and the poet's terseness are some serious statements about the nature of poetry. Looking down upon the heavens, the poet remembers Boethius:

And thoo thoughte y upon Boece,
 That writ, "A thought may flee so hye,
 Wyth fetheres of Philosophye,
 To passen everych element;
 And whan he hath so fer ywent,
 Than may be seen, behynde hys bak,
 Cloude..." (972-8)

The passage is delicately ironic in that the end of the journey is not to be Chaucer's home and "contree" (in the Boethian sense), but nevertheless there is the clear suggestion that the poet, like the philosopher, has the ability to comprehend lofty universal truths. It is

significant that Douglas uses the same image at the beginning of his journey of discovery with the Muses:

Tho samin furth we ryding all bedene
Als swift as thocht with mony a merie sang. (1076-7)

"Thocht" or intellect is that faculty which makes it possible for the poet both to comprehend more than his immediate environment and to reach further than a local or national audience. This function of the journey in The Palice of Honour coexists with that outlined by Bawcutt:

I take it [the journey] to be an allegory of a poet's education, a figurative account of studies which Boccaccio had considered essential for the aspiring poet; it was necessary not only to study grammar and rhetoric, but "to behold the monuments and relics of the Ancients, to have in one's memory the histories of the nations, and to be familiar with the geography of various lands, of seas, rivers, and mountains."¹⁸

Douglas's emphasis on the various aspects of the poet's education in the account of his journey is one which is not to be found in The Hous of Fame. In Part III of Douglas's poem the potential visionary power of the poet is stressed more strongly than it is in The Hous of Fame. The Dantesque vision of punishment and salvation (1347-77) has little in common with Chaucer's "shippe seyllynge in the see", but it is quite likely that Douglas may have developed his symbolic account of the "brukill eird" from Chaucer's more literal account of the earth seen from afar (896-909). Douglas echoes his predecessor's amazed response to his travels in describing his own experience:

Thoo gan y wexen in a were,
And seyde, "Y wot wel y am here;
But wher in body or in gost
I not, ywys; but God, thou wost! (HF, 979-82)

For quhiddel I this in saull or bodie saw
 That wait I nocht, bot he that all dois knaw,
 The greit God wait, in euerie thing perfite.
 (PH, 1264-6)

One of the minor literary themes of The Hous of Fame concerns the use of scientific subject matter in poetry. Bennett suggests that Chaucer's keen interest in scientific theory (manifested elsewhere in his writing, notably in A Treatise on the Astrolabe) led him to incorporate it into "the very stuff of his verse".¹⁹ The eagle's long discourse on the theory of sound (729-852) is brilliantly justified by its dramatic context. Douglas's appreciation of the passage is clearly indicated by his own digression on sound, prompted by the music which heralds the arrival of Venus's court (364-81). Like Chaucer's digression, that in The Palice of Honour is given a humorous edge by being self-depreciatory. The abrupt breaking-off - "Aneuch of this - I not quhat it may mene" - creates much the same effect as the unspoken terror of the poet during the eagle's sonorous "demonstracion".

Mention has been made above of the prominent position given to rhetorical preliminaries - appeals for the attention of the audience, promises of revelations to be made - in The Hous of Fame. Bennett's comment on the Invocation in Book II, that Chaucer "is still mocking himself and keeping his readers on the qui vive as he quickly shifts from one stance to another",²⁰ can fairly be applied to all of these passages. No doubt the actual presence of the poet would have provided some clarification, but one

suspects that this would not resolve completely the problems posed by Chaucer's rapidly fluctuating tone. What Chaucer seems to be attempting is simultaneously to make his audience aware of some of the serious creative problems confronting the poet and to play a sophisticated literary joke upon the reader. The lofty manner of most of these lines is distinctly at odds with the subject matter that follows, and is undercut further by the tripping form of the short couplet. The reader is several times prepared for something which does not happen, and the effect is that of imitating the confusion which surrounds the central subject of illusory fame. Critics have always been puzzled by The Hous of Fame, not least because of the grandiose manner of its various preliminaries. It is a reasonable supposition that Chaucer would have found this state of affairs eminently satisfying. Douglas follows Chaucer by including passages of rhetorical preliminary in his dream narrative. At the beginning of Part I, for example, there is an apostrophe to his creative powers,

Thow barrant wit, ouirset with fantasyis,
 Schaw now the craft, pat in thy memor lyis.
 Schaw now thy schame, schaw now thy bad nystie,
 Schaw thy endite, reprufe of Rethoryis.. (127-30)

which bears a general relationship to Chaucer's,

O Thought, that wrot al that I mette,
 And in the tresorye hyt shette
 Of my brayn, now shal men se
 Yf any vertu in the be,
 To tellen al my drem aryght. (523-7)

Neither is a simple captatio benevolentiae: both reflect a concern for clear and accurate expression, although what precedes the Chaucerian statement - comparison of the vision

with the great visions of the Bible and classical literature - is hardly to be taken at face value. Douglas's plea to the Muses to lend "a recent, schairp, fresche memorie" (1291) repeats the theme of the passage quoted, while the appeal for "facund castis Eloquent" (1290) and "gratious sweitnes" (1293) emphasizes the need for "craft". Both poets express their awareness that poetry may be misunderstood and misrepresented. Just as Chaucer calls down a curse upon "mysdemers", Douglas voices a fear that "Ianglaris suld it bakbite and stand nane aw" (1268). Expressions of lack of ability, of the need for external guidance and for the favourable disposition of the audience are of course part of the stock-in-trade of late medieval poets, and there can be no suggestion that in this respect Douglas gained his inspiration from Chaucer alone. What is important to note is that Douglas uses the topoi in much the same way that Chaucer does in The Hous of Fame, to draw attention to some of the poet's fundamental problems in a work in which poetry and the role of the poet are major themes.

Douglas's manner as narrator in these passages of rhetorical address is, obviously enough, quite un-Chaucerian. Addressing his audience directly, the author of The Palice of Honour is at all times clear and emphatic, with none of the quicksilver changes of "voice" which often make it difficult to determine Chaucer's attitude to his subject matter and his audience in The Hous of Fame. It is only at the conclusion of Troilus and Criseyde that

there is any equivalent in Chaucer's poetry to the authoritative affirmation of the value of Honour at the end of The Palice (2116-42). Here there is no place for irony and self-dramatization: the imaginative energies of the poet are devoted to evoking and illuminating the characteristics of his subject, and the "I" of the poet becomes inseparable from the "we" of his audience in the attitude of prayer,

I the require, sen thow but peir art best,
That efter this in thy hie blis we ring. (2123-4)

There is more to be said of the directness of Douglas's manner as narrator than that it conforms to the usual (non-Chaucerian) way of self-representation in dream vision poetry. It is more important to observe that Douglas adopts a voice which is appropriate to the dignity of his subject matter. The rhetorical preliminaries, for example, assist to foster an attitude of awe towards the noble subject of the quest for "hie Honour", and the concluding hymn is a ringing affirmation of life's supreme value. The only positive lesson which the journey in The Hous of Fame has to teach is that the pursuit of the poet's art is a superior good to the pursuit of fame - Chaucer's dream travels are shown to teach him very little more than he knew already from his reading. The suggestion has been made that Douglas consciously opposes the conception of Honour to the hollow value of Fame as it is defined in Chaucer's poem. This message is complemented by the poet's self-depiction: in marked contrast to his predecessor, Douglas portrays himself as one who has learnt a valuable

truth, that Honour is immutable, and that it is the poet's duty to write in the service of Honour.

The first person method of The Palice of Honour is similar to that of The Kingis Quair, in that an implied contrast between the then and the now of the poet's experience is important to the meaning. Through his self-depiction Douglas, like James I, shows a development of awareness about the nature of Venus's operations, although of course the educative process in The Palice is directed primarily towards an increase in awareness of the nature and value of poetry. Like his royal predecessor, Douglas had obviously learned from Chaucer's dream-vision poems the value of humour in the depiction of his past self, and the "I" of The Palice of Honour is modelled to a large extent on the "I" of The Hous of Fame. The note of humorous self-depreciation is of course just as much a part of Douglas's statement about the nature of poetry as it is of Chaucer's in The Hous of Fame: however serious its purpose, there is always a place for laughter in a long narrative poem. Douglas goes even further than Chaucer in making fearfulness one of the main characteristics of his fictional self. Prior to the dream itself, the sound of the voice in the garden singing its tribute to love and the light from heaven drive him to extreme panic, so that he falls down insensible into the shrubbery:

Amid the virgultis all in till a fary
As feminine so feblit fell I down. (107-8)

The terrors of the desert are not so much real as imagined:

the living creatures there, described as "grym monstures", are after all only fish. Such is his "megirnes and pusillamitie" that "The stichling of a Mous out of presence/ Had bene to me mair vgsum than the Hell" (308-9). Douglas's fear at all stages of his journey to the court of Honour clearly recalls Chaucer's state of mind en route to the house of Fame. Confronted with the angry figure of Venus, the poet's main fear is that of being metamorphosed:

Bot sair I dred me for sum vther Iaip,
That Venus suld throw hir subtillitie
In till sum bysning beist transfigurat me
As in a Beir, a Bair, ane Oule, ane Aip.
I traistit sa for till haue bene mischaip
That oft I wald my hand behald to se
Gif it alterit, and oft my visage graip. (738-44)

The inspiration for this is the quaking poet's inability to accept the eagle's genial reassurances in The Hous of Fame:

"O God!" thoughte I, "that madest kynde,
Shal I noon other weyes dye?
Wher Joves wol me stellyfye,
Or what thing may this sygnifye?" (584-7)

In both passages the humour is enriched by the dreamers' recollection of classical and biblical precedents for such transformations: Chaucer thinks of Enoch, Elijah, Romulus and Ganymede (588-92), while Douglas remembers the fates of Acteon, Io, Lot's wife, and Nebuchadnezzar (745-58). As in The Hous of Fame and The Parlement of Foules, the timorousness of the poet in The Palice of Honour makes it necessary for his guide to behave boisterously. The nymph who drags the stupefied poet up the mountain by his hair, and who pushes him through the palace gates scolding,

Quhat deuell.. hes thow nocht ellis ado
Bot all thy wit and fantasie to set
On sic doting? (1866-8)

is a direct descendant of the eagle who says of Fame's house, "Hyt is nothing will byten the" (1044). Douglas's "I", like Chaucer's, "sweats" in fear (HF 1043; PH 1868). The passage in The Palice of Honour also recalls the scene in The Parlement of Foules in which Africanus unceremoniously pushes the dreamer through the gates of the garden of love.

Like James I, Henryson, and Dunbar, Douglas follows the medieval tradition (not exclusively a Chaucerian one) of incorporating fragments of autobiography in the presentation of a semi-fictional portrait. Douglas's use of this kind of irony is to some extent modelled on Chaucer's practice in the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women. There, Chaucer shows himself being arraigned before the stern God of Love because of his activities as a poet who has "werreyed" and hindered those in the service of Love (F, 322-7). The poet in The Palice of Honour is accused by Venus of subverting her operations in his role of cleric:

3e bene the men bewrayis my commandis.
 3e bene the men disturbis my seruandis.
 3e bene the men with wickit wordis feill,
 Quhilk blasphemis fresche lustie 3oung gallandis
 That in my seruice and retinew standis. (718-22)

Like Chaucer, he is charged further that he is "unable" himself in the practice of Love (LGW Prol. 320; PH 717). Just as Chaucer makes an ineffectual plea that he is perfectly entitled to kneel by the God's flower ("And why, sire .. and yt lyke yow?"), Douglas tries to advance his clerical status as a reason for not being tried by Venus:

And mairatouir I am na seculair.
 A spirituall man - thocht I be void of lair -
 Cleipit I am, and aucht my liues space
 To be remit till my Iudge ordinair. (696-9)

The whole trial scene in The Palice of Honour is modelled on the central episode of Chaucer's Prologue to The Legend of Good Women, a work which through its emphasis on writing and on the role of the poet has affinities with The Hous of Fame. In both poems there is the charge of blasphemy against the love deity, and in both there is the irony that fear deprives the poets of all eloquence. Calliope plays the same role as Alceste plays in Chaucer's poem: she is the friend of poetry and poets, who intercedes with the angry deity on behalf of the poet, thereby securing his conditional release. Just as Chaucer is obliged to write a work in honour of Love - "A glorious legende/ Of goode wymmen", Douglas is commanded to compose "sum brief/ Or schort ballat" and to be prepared for Venus's next order. Calliope uses the same basic argument in the poet's defence that Alceste uses in the Prologue, that it would be degrading to the divine estate to punish an insignificant man for "sa small ane cryme" (LGW Prol. 384-410; PH 955-63). Both scenes argue for the physical detachment of the poet in the service of Love and thus for the special authority of poets: like Chaucer, Douglas engages in light-hearted self-advertisement of his status as a writer with an allegiance to Love. It is obvious of course that Douglas's trial scene is in no way a replica of Chaucer's. As Bawcutt rightly observes, "Chaucer makes light and graceful play with the religion of love, whereas Douglas devises an

elaborate parody of Scottish legal conventions and terminology".²¹ It is possible that the localizing of the scene in this way was inspired by the forensic rhetoric of Henryson's poetry: in The Sheep and the Dog, for example, the accused sheep, like Douglas's self-representation, attempts to "declyne" the judge. (Doubtless later readers of The Palice of Honour were reminded of the poet's attempt in 1515 to claim the privilege of clergy during litigation over his right to the bishopric of Dunkeld.)²² It is also worth noting that Douglas fits Calliope's pleading into the context of his overall theme. The scene makes the point that Venus's virtues of "mercie and pietie" are inseparable from Honour (956-60), so it comes as no surprise when Venus is found to be present at the court of Honour.

Although the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women is important as the source of one episode of The Palice of Honour, Douglas makes much fuller reference to The Hous of Fame. There are several parallels of narrative detail between the two which help to reinforce the implied "sentence" about the superiority of Honour over Fame as the goal of a poet's quest. Attention has already been drawn to the Scots poet's substitution of a "Roche of slid, hard Marbell stone" (1300) for Chaucer's "roche of yse, and not of stel" (1130). There are several other instances of the altering of Chaucer's details in order to describe something which is much more impressive than its counterpart in The Hous of Fame. For example, Chaucer's gallery of famous historians and poets (1429-512) is extended from

twelve to thirty-six in Douglas's account of the court of Poetry (895-924): to Chaucer's "classics" are added humanist poets and translators of recent memory and both Scots and English vernacular poets (including of course Chaucer himself). Several commentators have observed that Douglas's rich and elaborate court of Honour is modelled on Chaucer's description of Fame's dwelling.²³ Both edifices have richly ornamented gates of gold (HF 1294-304; PH 1834-63), walls of beryl (HF 1288; PH 1888), and an abundance of other jewelled decoration. The servitors of both Fame and Honour are apparelled in rich "cote-armure" (HF 1326-8; PH 1918-20), and the deities themselves are to be found on jewelled thrones set high above the level of their halls (HF 1360-1; PH 1901-2).²⁴

The obvious difference between such points of narrative similarity in the two poems rests in Douglas's un-Chaucerian fondness for amplification in description. Where Chaucer declines to elaborate on the interior decoration of Fame's court ("But hit were al to longe to rede/ The names, and therefore I pace"), the Scots poet delights in giving a full and detailed account of his palace's jewelled splendour (1875-917). This interest in extended descriptio, which is sustained throughout the poem, is only one of the ways in which Douglas demonstrates his mastery of a particular kind of poetic craft. Extensive analysis of the variety of stylistic effects employed in The Palice of Honour is beyond the scope of this study, but some of the more striking of them may be noted. The most

striking feature of Douglas's poetic vocabulary is the number of sonorous, self-consciously "new" polysyllabic words which it contains: the "high style" of rhetoric is stressed by the tendency to rhyme such words (e.g., "persauabill" - "dissauabill" - "variabill" - "agreeabill"). At the other extreme, there is a high proportion of shorter, less dignified words drawn from the vernacular - e.g., "skauppis", "fow", "pluk", "smy". Bawcutt draws attention to the decorum which governs Douglas's use of words: "It is noticeable that the aureate words tend to cluster most thickly (together with the rhetorical patterns) in the Prologue and other more ornate parts of the poem, such as the description of Venus and her court, or the panegyric on the Muses. By contrast, the 'rude' and 'rurall' words are most prominent in passages of abusive dialogue or scenes of terror."²⁵ Although this tendency is present, it is important to recognize that Douglas exercises a strict control over his use of the high style, balancing the abstract against the particular, the simple against the ornate. The same kind of control characterizes the use of various forms of rhetorical elaboration, e.g., antithesis (174-81), interpretatio (1015-20, 1025-34), repetitio (128-34, 403-10, 835-46), and exclamatio (166-92, 2116-42). Even when Douglas strains rhetoric to its limit, the effect is never ponderous: e.g., in the antithesis noted above, (174-81) there is considerable variety of verbal effect within the rigid pattern of the lines. The stanza form of the first two Books, the complicated Anelida and Arcite model with which Dunbar and Henryson also experiment, is

itself a remarkable exercise in virtuosity, considering the length of the poem, and it is perfectly fitting that it should conclude with two dazzling stanzas which incorporate both the Anelida rhyme scheme and internal rhyme. The earlier part of Book III uses the equally difficult Complaint of Mars stanza, and it would appear that Douglas's choice of the two forms which Chaucer uses only for short poems was intended to draw attention to his own technical superiority.

The "fouth" or fullness of The Palice of Honour, exemplified in these and other forms of stylistic display, is one of the most original features of the poem. C.S. Lewis, expanding the earlier comments of David Irving²⁶ and T.F. Henderson,²⁷ damns with faint praise by attributing to Douglas a preoccupation with manner at the expense of matter and meaning:

.. what Douglas describes is sheer wonderland, a phantasmagoria of dazzling lights and eldritch glooms, whose real raison d'être is not their allegorical meaning, but their immediate appeal to the imagination.²⁸

Douglas's style is chosen to complement his elevated subject matter. This theory of decorum finds allegorical expression in the account of the garden of rhetoric towards the end of the poem, "Quhair precious stanis on treis dois abound/ In steid of frute chargeit with peirlis round" (2069-70). The stylistic fullness of the poem is, in my view, an integral part of Douglas's commentary on The Hous of Fame. In Chaucer's first and third Books the jiggling octosyllabic couplets tend to produce a monotonous effect,

and the poet declares that his intention is to show "sentence" at the expense of "craft" (1099-100). The style is well chosen to complement the poet's sense of ironic detachment from Fame and her works. Douglas's conception of Honour, infinitely more worthy than Fame as a goal for writers and humanity in general, requires a more dignified style of presentation: stanza form and language are more elaborate than anything to be found in The Hous of Fame.

For all his interest in rhetorical display, Douglas never loses sight of his central theme. Fox's view of the poem, which is very similar to that of Lewis, leads him to make this comparison with The Hous of Fame:

But for all of Chaucer's influence, it must be admitted that the poem seems to a modern reader profoundly un-Chaucerian. In The House of Fame, for all its preposterous plot, there is a smooth and plausible narrative line, and the narrator always seems to be present in his flesh and blood. But The Palace of Honour is a glittering and artificial poem: Douglas seems to make no effort to preserve any reasonable narrative coherence, or to impart any feeling of verisimilitude.²⁹

A more accurate picture of both poems is obtained by reversing Fox's views: The Pallice of Honour, despite its glitter and artificiality, is much more coherent than The Hous of Fame, and it is reasonable to assume that Douglas learnt a valuable lesson from the inconclusiveness of the English poem. The assumption that "a smooth and plausible narrative line" and "narrative coherence" produce a coherent poem is unwarrantable, as The Hous of Fame illustrates. The poem suffers from structural imbalance. For example, the purpose of the retelling of the Aeneid is clear enough, but the episode is allowed to run on for too long. This

effect might have been averted by a more vigorous treatment of the story - perhaps through more variation from the basic octosyllabic couplet pattern. It is clear that Chaucer is attempting to illustrate the traditional basis of poetic art by adapting Virgil, but the length of the episode is hardly justified by the rather trite moral adduced from it - "Allas! what harm doth apparence/ Whan hit is fals in existence!" (265-6). The long description of Fame's treatment of her supplicants in Book III suffers from the same fault of prolixity: the moral that Fame is unstable and arbitrary is sounded very clearly in the description of the lady herself, with the result that the mathematical regularity of the tableau soon becomes tedious. These two main structural "blocks" of the poem are separated by the account of the journey in Book II, the most successful part of the poem because of its variety and sense of dramatic occasion. Chaucer may be criticized for not relating the temple of Venus episode and the account of Fame more closely: they read as literary "set-pieces" rather than as parts of an integrated whole. In Book II the eagle is quite insistent that the purpose of the journey is that the poet may receive "tydynges... of Loves folk" (606-99), but this theme is not introduced until late in the poem, as part of the description of the house of Rumour (2143). Perhaps Chaucer broke off soon after this because he realized how unwieldy his poetic structure had become. Certainly by the middle of "This lytel laste bok" the poem is remarkable neither for "craft" nor "sentence", let alone a skilful fusion of the two. In The

Parlement of Foules, Chaucer is much more successful in organizing the blocks of narrative associated with Scipio, Venus, and Nature into a coherent and meaningful whole.

From a structural point of view, The Palice of Honour resembles The Parlement of Foules more than The Hous of Fame. Douglas's poem does have a smooth narrative line - the poet's journey to the palace - and the successive stages of his experience are integral parts of a developing argument about the nature of Honour and the poet's allegiance to Honour. In the Prologue and Part I the relationship between the poet and Venus is explored in some detail: he describes himself as being perplexed and troubled by love, and it is not until Calliope intervenes that he is able to enter into a harmonious relationship with Venus. Part II describes the comprehensiveness, beauty, and durability of poetry, through the metaphor of the company of poets who travel together harmoniously through time and space. In Part III Honour is identified with a scheme of universal moral values: the "terribill sewch" and its allegorical significance expounded by the nymph provide an effective introduction to the description of the palace and of Honour's household. In his final section Douglas returns to several scenes and ideas from the earlier part of the poem. Sinon and Achitophel, for example, reappear to emphasize the antipathy between treachery and Honour: like other traitors, they are pushed away from the palace walls (1768-82). The themes of poetic subject matter and the poet's observance to Venus, introduced in Part II, are

amplified in the Venus's mirror episode, as I have already shown.

Throughout The Palice of Honour, shifts of setting are used to reinforce meaning. The idealized garden of the Prologue, symbolic of Nature's regenerative power, gives way to a barren and desert landscape; devoid of art, which functions as an objective correlative of the dreamer's state of mind. Significantly, he finds himself in this environment as the result of an exclamation of mingled guilt and despair (91-9). The desert landscape is an amplification of the "large feld ... Withouten toun, or hous, or tree" into which the dreamer wanders in The Hous of Fame. Douglas's description is much more detailed and evocative, however, and unlike Chaucer's passage, it plays a vital part in the poem's thematic development. The coming of Venus's court brings a change to the landscape, but this does not bring any relief to the poet:

Me thocht the feild ouirspred with Carpettis fair
 (Quhilk was tofoir brint, barrane, vile and bair)
 Wox maist plesand, bot all, the suith to say,
 Micht nocht ameis my greuous panefull sair. (660-63)

The garden of the Muses, with its variegated growth, "beriall stremis", birds and bees (1145-52), recalls the "Gardyne of plesance" at the beginning of the poem, but in it the poet feels none of his waking anxiety. The image of the Muses' garden recurs in Part III: Calliope's nymph leads the poet to where the "sweit flureist flouris of Rethor" grow in the land of Honour (2062-79), which is itself "ane plane of peirles pulchritude". His weakness

prevents him from entering, and he awakes to find himself back in the natural garden where his vision began. His awareness of the difference between the two gardens contributes to his allegiance to the eternal realm of poetry,

The birdis sang nor zit the merie flouris
 Micht not ameis my greuous greit dolouris.
 All eirdlie thing me thocht barrane and vile.
 Thus I remanit into the Garth twa houris,
 Cursand the feildis with all the fair coluris,
 That I awolk oft wariand the quhile.
 Always my minde was on the lustie Ile.
 I purpoisit euer till haue dwelt in that art,
 Of Rethorik cullouris till haue found sum part.
 (2098-106)

Fox's view that the poem lacks narrative cohesion is not altogether compatible with his appreciation of Douglas's scene-shifting effects: "the pervasive theme of the contrast between earthly mutability and transcendental perfection is repeatedly brought out by the juxtaposition of contrasting scenes".³⁰ A careful reading of the poem shows that there is no foundation for Fox's charge that it lacks the kind of continuity and dramatic immediacy which Chaucer achieves through his self-depiction as dreamer and narrator. The "I" of The Palice of Honour, modelled on the Chaucerian narrator, is always present to record his reactions to scenes and events, and the human comedy which results is the ideal contrast to the lofty passages of idealized description.

The sonorous finality of The Palice of Honour is in marked contrast to the inconclusiveness of The Hous of Fame. Where Chaucer's poem simply trails off before the appearance of the "man of gret auctorite", the Scots work

is rounded off with a strong affirmation of Honour. Fox misreads the poem by finding "an ambiguous climax, or perhaps more exactly .. a lack of climax". The comment refers to the poet's reaction to the sight of "ane God omnipotent". Fox's comparison with the ending of The Hous of Fame is a false one, simply because the episode referred to is the climax of the journey rather than the climax of the poem. There is nothing ambiguous about the poet's swoon. His inability to endure the glorious sight of Honour and later to cross the bridge into the garden of Poetry creates the same effect as the poet's inability to cross the stream to the New Jerusalem in Pearl - the impossibility of full mortal possession of what is by nature immortal and immutable. Comparison with The Hous of Fame should of course be made, but comparison of a different kind. The expression of painful regret which follows the poet's return to the waking world and the ornate hymn to Honour are ways of emphasizing the value of the dream experience for the poet. Chaucer's dream, by the nature of its goal, can bring no such certainty. The replacement of Chaucerian tentativeness with a strong sense of commitment to an ideal is the logical accompaniment to the other variations, both thematic and stylistic, which are played on The Hous of Fame throughout The Palice of Honour.

It is probable that in writing The Palice of Honour Douglas drew not only upon Chaucer, but also upon Lydgate. Lydgate's influence may be discerned in Douglas's use of the high style, in his fondness for polysyllabic words,

self-consciously artificial images, and intricate rhetorical structures. It cannot be claimed, however, that Lydgate's influence upon Douglas is very great: the "high style" of The Palice of Honour is notably higher than that of Lydgate's non-religious poetry. Like his English contemporary Stephen Hawes, Douglas extends the ornate style of Lydgate's religious verse to secular subject matter, and in doing this he is supported by the practice of the rhétoriqueurs. In The Palice of Honour there is nothing which corresponds to that strict use of aureation - the introduction of what Pearsall calls "a florid Latinate diction, with the Latin barely digested into English"³¹ - which is Lydgate's most notable contribution to the ornate style in English. Dunbar, on the other hand, does draw upon Lydgate's exercises in this strict aureate mode, and in poems such as The Thrissil and the Rois and The Goldyn Targe it is possible to point to Lydgatian sources for particular techniques and images. The Palice of Honour illustrates no comparable direct relationship to Lydgate's poetry, and all that can be said of this English influence is that Douglas develops and amplifies certain tendencies of Lydgate's style.

Chapter VI

Dunbar, Chaucer, and Lydgate.

Like his predecessors and contemporaries, William Dunbar expresses his admiration and respect for English poetry - the work of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate. Although these are the only non-Scottish writers, apart from Ovid and Cicero, whom he mentions by name, his verse indicates knowledge of several other kinds of literature: the Roman de la Rose, the work of later French rhétoriciens and lyricists, secular and devotional lyrics in Latin, and perhaps most important of all, the alliterative poetry of his own country which derives from northern English work. As I have tried to show in the preceding chapters, James I, Henryson, and Douglas, in their different ways, use the poetry of Chaucer (and to a lesser extent the poetry of Lydgate) as a source of themes and subject matter, and (in the Quair and the Testament in particular) as a guide to style. Their very considerable inventiveness lies largely in the assimilation and alteration of the borrowings, in order to complement their own distinctive thematic objectives. The question of Dunbar's indebtedness to English poetry has a similar kind of complexity to that of Henryson's indebtedness to The Nun's Priest's Tale in the first part of The Tod. When we read Dunbar's poetry, just as when we read The Cock and the Fox, we feel that the poet was guided to some extent in his choice of subject matter and style by his reading of English poetry, but the distance between poem and possible source is often so wide as to preclude absolute certainty. There are a few of Dunbar's poems for which sources in the work of either Chaucer or Lydgate may reasonably be assumed, but as I shall attempt to show, some points

of resemblance may be accounted for by the fact that the poems in which they occur belong to the same genre or tradition. The fact that there are very few clear verbal parallels between the work of Dunbar and his English predecessors also makes caution necessary.

It is not possible to give a very comprehensive appreciation of Dunbar's originality in the scope of a single chapter simply because of the great diversity of his work. My intention is to show how an appreciation of some of Dunbar's poems is furthered by comparison with their generic counterparts in earlier English poetry, even if these may not always be regarded as definite sources. We have already seen how the concluding stanzas of The Goldyn Targe, which obliquely present Dunbar's claim to be considered as a poet whose status is at least equal to that of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate, also suggest a discrimination between Chaucer and the other two.¹ Chaucer is acknowledged as the chief of poets - "Thou beris of makaris the tryumph ryall". Since Dunbar does make this discrimination, his use of Chaucer's poetry - illustrated principally in the Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo and Sir Thomas Norny - may be considered before turning to the matter of his indebtedness to Lydgate.

The similarities between the Tretis and the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale relate more to form and substance than to style. Stylistically, the poem is a tour de force, in which Dunbar explores the potentialities of alliterative

metre and poetic vocabulary, applying them to subject matter which ranges between the wild extremes of amour courtois and savage sexuality. This extended and virtuose use of alliteration could only have been made by a northern poet, and it obviously has no Chaucerian precedent. It will be necessary to consider other differences between the Tretis and the Wife of Bath's Prologue, but the similarities should be discussed first.

The most obvious resemblance between the Tretis and Chaucer's work is the use of extended dramatic monologue for the purposes of satirical self-revelation. There are important differences of emphasis, but the "moralitie" of Dunbar's poem is closely related to that of the Wife's Prologue and Tale. As the knight errant learns from the crone,

Wommen desiren to have sovereyntee
As wel over hir housbond as hir love,
And for to been in maistrie hym above. (D, 1038-40)

Both poems base their satire on the form of an experienced woman's confession. Dunbar's widow, although her experience of marriage is not as impressive numerically as the Wife of Bath's, clearly shares the latter's belief that experience confers the right and the authority to instruct others. In the Tretis, as in the Prologue, self-revelation has the quality of advice. The Wife gives an answer to the Pardoner's request to "teche us yonge men", while the Wedo, with even sharper irony, undertakes to tell her two "sisteris in schrift" how they should be "mekar to men in maneris and conditiounis". Both women assume the role of priestesses

in the twin arts of sexual indulgence and sexual domination, and Dunbar, like Chaucer, introduces an element of sermon parody. The Wife's specious use of biblical authority at the beginning of her story has its counterpart in the Wedo's appeal for divine guidance before she begins,

God my spreit now inspir and my speche quykkyn,
And send me sentence to say, substantious and noble;
Sa that my preching may pers your perverst hertis..(247-9)

As self-appointed sexual divines, Wife and Wedo presume to make general pronouncements upon female psychology, and both speak as the representatives of "we women": e.g.,

We love no man that taketh kep or charge
Wher that we goon; we wol ben at oure large.

Deceite, wepyng, spynnyng God hath yive
To wommen kyndely, whil that they may lyve... (WB Prol,
321-22, 401-2)

for certis, we wemen
We set us all fra the syght to syle men of treuth:
We dule for na evill deid, sa it be derne haldin.
Wise wemen has wayis and wonderfull gydingis
With gret engyne to bejaip ther jolyus husbandis;
And quyetly, with sic craft, convoyis our materis
That, under Crist, no creatur kennis of our doingis.
(Tretis, 448-54)

Both represent themselves as examples of the realized potential of the female spirit and body.

Not surprisingly, there are several correspondences of detail between the two confessions. In the Wedo, as in the Wife of Bath, strong sexual appetite is accompanied by ruthless materialism: both demand the "lond" and the "tresoor" of the husbands whom they scorn (WB Prol, 204-13, 410-17; Tretis, 337-42) in return for the granting of sexual favours. The Wedo, like the Wife, delights in humiliating her husband before her women friends (WB Prol, 534-42; Tretis, 353-8).

Both use the wealth extracted from their husbands for personal adornment: the Wife's visits in her finery,

To vigilies and to processiouns,
To prechyng eek, and to thise pilgrimages,
To pleyes of myracles, and to mariages.. (556-8)

have their counterpart in the Wedo's "passing of pilgrimage" (474), but a closer parallel to Chaucer is the longing of the first of Dunbar's wives,

at fairis be found new faceis to se;
At playis, and at preichingis, and pilgrimages greit,
To schaw my renone, royaly, quhair preis was of folk..(70-2)

Like the Wife, the Wedo has no scruples about feigning grief as she goes through the motions of religious observance. Dame Alice makes a show of grief at her fourth husband's funeral - "for it is usage" (589) - to cover her search for a new "paire/ Of legges and of feet so clene and faire"(597-8). Similarly, the Wedo attends mass to make fresh conquests (534-5), wetting her cheeks with a sponge to win the sympathy of her late husband's friends (436-43). Both women avail themselves of the favours of obliging servants: the "lufsammer leid" of whom the Wedo boasts (283) has an ancestor in the "apprentice Janekyn" who squires the Wife up and down (303-5).

Chaucer gives an edge to the Wife's aggressive assertion of female sovereignty by incorporating a dramatic sexual conflict in her narrative. She engages with three male members of the Canterbury company: the Pardoner, whom she rebukes by telling a story unlike the one he had expected, the Friar, whose mockery she repays by a scathing reference to "lymytours and othere hooly freres" (867), and the Clerk,

who avenges her gibe at his calling by the sarcastic allusion at the end of his tale to the "secte" of the Wife of Bath (E, 1170-2). The Tretis also presents - admittedly less directly - a conflict between male and female, outside the context of the three confessions. The women are so frank in their disclosures only because they believe that no man is listening ("ther is no spy neir", 161). The poet of course is listening from behind the hedge, and he has no scruples about reporting their confessions to his own audience, which presumably includes a high proportion of men (530). The "overhearing" device is a structural feature of the chansons à mal mariée,² but the French poets make no attempt to use it to complement their subject matter. Dunbar's ingenious alignment of structure with content is more reminiscent of the dramatic ironies of Chaucer's poem.

In terms of style, the Tretis resembles the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale in its yoking together of two rhetorical extremes, the animalistic and the courtly. In Chaucer, the contrast is between the mode of the Prologue and the mode of the Tale. Alice's earthy view of sex is expressed in the kind of reference which she uses: she accepts the validity of her old husband's simile of the cat (348-56), going on to liken herself to a horse (386), and later to draw attention to her "coltes tooth" (602). This kind of reference could not be further removed from the courtly ambience of the Tale, which explores the nature of "gentillesse". The principal irony of the Tale is that its teller fails to live up to the definition of gentleness

advanced by the crone - "Thanne, am I gentil, whan that I bigynne/ To lyven vertuously and weyve synne" (1175-6).

Dunbar exploits the difference between high and low styles much more thoroughly. Courtly conventions and the courtly ethic are invoked in the introductory descriptive passage, in the concluding demande d'amour, and in the Wedo's reference to the central tenet of feminine pity,³

Bot mercy in to womanheid is a mekle vertu,
For never bot in gentill hert is generit ony ruth.
(315-16)

On the other level, there is a profusion of animal references, applied to men and women alike: man is likened to a horse (114, 354-7), a worm (89), a "dotit dog" (186),⁴ while women are associated not only with birds, but also with savage beasts,⁵

Thought ye as tygris be terne, be trefable in luf,
And be as turtoris in your talk, thought ye haif talis
brukill;
Be dragonis baith and dowis ay in double forme,
And quhen it nedis yow, onone, note baith ther
strenthis;
Be amyable with humble face, as angellis apperand,
And with a terrebill tail be stangand as eddiris.
(261-6)

The difference in tone between Dunbar and Chaucer is well illustrated by the fact that the Wedo embraces an extreme of animalistic description which the Wife of Bath rejects: Alice's response to her fifth husband's taunt that women are like lions and dragons (776-7) is well-known. The extreme of imagery in the Scots poem verges on the diabolical.

The parallels between the Tretis and the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale are sufficient, in my view, to justify the belief that Dunbar knew Chaucer's poem, and that it may

be regarded as the most important single source of the Tretis. By itself, any one of the similarities noted above would not constitute evidence of borrowing and adaptation, but the combination in Dunbar's poem of a number of the features of Chaucer's work does seem conclusive. Two qualifications must, however, be kept in mind. The first is that Dunbar almost certainly knew the corpus of antifeminist satire which forms the background of the Wife's Prologue and Tale. The notion of woman as a being innately concupiscent, deceitful, and intent on domination is reiterated by classical and medieval commentators and poets. Bartlett J. Whiting singles out four main "sources" for Chaucer's portrait of the Wife of Bath: Jerome's Epistola adversus Jovinianum, Walter Map's De Nugis Curialium, the Roman de la Rose, and Deschamps' Miroir de Mariage.⁶ He might have chosen others, among them the portrait of Dipsas in Ovid's Amores. Any of these works may have been known to Dunbar: for example, the Wedo's ruse of wetting her cheeks with a sponge has an Ovidian rather than a Chaucerian source. Although in form and detail the Wedo's monologue resembles the Wife's Prologue, the form of the Tretis as a whole has closer affinities with the Old French chanson à mal mariée. It shares with this type the framework of an overheard complaint by either a young woman yoked to an aged husband, or a discussion of marriage by a group of wedded women. The tendency towards satire of the complainant is another feature of the chanson, which may be seen in Clapperton's In Bowdoun on Blak Monunday.⁷

It is necessary to be cautious about applying a Chaucerian label to the Tretis for the additional reason that the tone of Dunbar's satire is very different from that of Chaucer's satire. The portrait of the Wife is genial and compassionate, and the audience is invited not to revile, but to smile at the chauvinism of the character. The Wife of Bath, in comparison with any of Dunbar's women, is a three-dimensional figure. She mocks all of her husbands, yet she is willing to admit to some genuine affection (526), and despite her avarice, she concedes that desire may override the acquisitive urge (621-6). The Wife attracts sympathy because of her awareness of Time's challenge (470-8), the awareness which gives her tale of the crone and the knight the dimension of wish-fulfilment. Dunbar may well have appreciated the delicate psychological realism of Chaucer's satire, but he makes no attempt to imitate it. The marital sufferings of the first two of Dunbar's women compel a limited amount of sympathy, but with the Wedo's sermon the poem moves into the realm of fantasy. The portrait of woman's cruelty and depravity is just as unreal in its own way as the description of idealized Nature and idealized feminine beauty with which the poem opens. There is nothing in the Wedo's confession which corresponds in tone to the warmth which Dame Alice feels for her most recent husband, or to her nostalgia for youth. The accretion of unpleasant physical and psychological detail in the Tretis, rendered all the more vivid by alliteration, produces an effect which is so grotesque that it is difficult to believe that any serious "moralitie" about women,

marriage, or sexuality in general is intended. Dunbar's characters do not have the three-dimensional quality which Tom Scott claims for them,⁸ and it is absurdly romantic to draw the biographical inference that

There is an element of masochism in the 'Tretis' - the hypersensitive Dunbar is torturing his own sensibility by piling up the evidence, delving deeper and deeper into the depravity of his women, thravnly hurting himself unnecessarily.⁹

The poem is a species of court entertainment, with an appeal which is much the same as the appeal of the flyting. The taste for this kind of vituperative poetry is as distinctively Scottish as the taste for alliteration, and one suspects that Chaucer and his audience would have found it rather difficult to comprehend.

Of Sir Thomas Norny bears a relationship to Chaucer's Tale of Sir Thopas which is comparable to that which exists between the Tretis and the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale. Chaucer's burlesque of tail-rhyme romance is without precedent, and given the fact that manuscripts of The Canterbury Tales had been in circulation for the best part of a century before Dunbar wrote his poem, it seems highly unlikely that Sir Thomas Norny could have come into being completely independent of Chaucer's "drasty speche".

Several critics have commented on the affinity between the two poems,¹⁰ and it has been studied in some detail by Elizabeth Roth Eddy,¹¹ whose work shows indebtedness to an earlier article by F.B. Snyder.¹² Mrs Eddy points to an interesting feature of the poem's style, the use of a comparatively large number of southern words and forms, and

suggests that this indicates that Dunbar is parodying southern taste for metrical romance, perhaps even "consciously reminding his listeners of 'Sir Thopas' itself".¹³ I think it very likely that Dunbar was inviting comparison with Sir Thopas, but it is a comparison which illuminates the differences rather than the similarities between his approach and Chaucer's. The humorous appeal of Sir Thopas, as Muscatine observes, lies largely in "its play with a mixture of romance convention and mundane imagery":¹⁴ the hero "fair and gent" who aspires to perform chivalrous deeds in love and war, wears "hosen broun" from Bruges, and rides not a charger but a dapple-grey steed which "gooth an ambil in the way". There is slight element of satire in the Tale - its hero has a decidedly bourgeois charm - but its main feature is parody of a gentle and good-humoured kind. Chaucer invites his audience to observe the monotony and the absurd anticlimaxes which the use of jingling tail-rhymes and short end lines may produce, and intensifies the absurdity by applying a trivializing style to a delightfully trivial subject. Like Chaucer, Dunbar exploits the conventions of the tail-rhyme romance - the minstrel's call for attention, the recitation of the hero's pedigree, the stereotyped account of "aunters" in love and war, the comparison with other heroes - for a purpose other than the conventional one of glorification. It is obvious, though, that Dunbar does not borrow from Chaucer in his use of conventional tags: phrases such as "full mony valyeand deid", "halff so gryt renowne", and "wan the gre" are lifted directly from serious romances of the kind which Chaucer is

parodying.

Whereas Chaucer uses the romance form for parody, Dunbar uses it for the purposes of satire, a satire which is very different in kind from that of Sir Thopas. (Chaucer's hero is absurd not so much because of his bourgeois appearance as because of his effeminacy and inflated idealism.) Dunbar's satire is both personal and social: the hero, one of James's court fools,¹⁵ is "ane Helandman",¹⁶ and the poet invites his audience to see the comic absurdity inherent in any aspiration to "gentill" standards on the part of one whose origins are obscure and whose occupation lowly. Where Chaucer exploits the anti-climactic tendency of the "tail" for parodic effect ("He hadde a semely nose"), Dunbar exploits it for satirical purposes: e.g.,

At feastis and brydallis upaland
He wan the gre and the garland;
Dansit non so on deis:
He hes att werslingis bein ane hunder,
Yet lay his body never at under:
He knawis giff this be leis. (19-24)

There is nothing cruel about Dunbar's satire here - the tone is very different from that of the Epitaphe for Donald Owre. The very fact that its subject is a court fool implies a degree of complicity on his part, and the last lines are in the nature of a tribute - Thomas Norny may not be "wys and wycht", but he is worthy to be considered as the lord of court fools. The reference to "Pesche and Yull" establishes that the poem was intended as a court entertainment (these were especially festive occasions in the royal household),¹⁷ and it is hence hardly surprising that there

is an atmosphere of "in-joke". The allusions to Curry and to the quarrel between Thomas and Quenetyne no doubt meant much more to James's courtiers than they do to us, but it is scarcely fair to complain on this account that the poem lacks "imaginative weight".¹⁸

Although Dunbar must have known Chaucer's poem, and although there is a likelihood that Sir Thopas provided the inspiration for Sir Thomas, the works are very different. Both treat the conventions of romance in an unconventional way, but Dunbar's poem is more strongly localized than Chaucer's. Localized in two senses: in using a particular person as a butt for comic satire, and also in being a distinctively Scottish species of court entertainment. The Scottishness of Sir Thomas, as of much of Dunbar's other poetry, rests in references to particular people and to distinctively Scottish institutions, and also in a delight in exaggeration which verges on the grotesque. What Dunbar does with Sir Thopas is very much like what he does with the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale: Chaucer's poems may have provided the germ of inspiration, but his own work is powerfully original, reflecting an awareness of what will appeal to his own audience. The psychological delicacies of the Wife of Bath's narrative are neglected in favour of a larger-than-life style of invective which is akin to the flyting, just as the delicate literary satire of Chaucer's tale of Sir Thopas is replaced by a more direct and more specific form of satire. Both Scots poems, too, are considerably shorter than their Chaucerian counterparts, and

comparison between the Scots and the English works suggests that Dunbar places a high value upon economy and concentration of effect. Like Henryson, Dunbar seems to have made a conscious decision to avoid Chaucer's more copious and leisurely method. Chaucer's poems may be regarded as sources for Sir Thopas and The Tretis - just as The Nun's Priest's Tale may be regarded as a source for the first part of The Tod - but like Henryson, Dunbar is far from regarding Chaucer's work as a model of style or subject matter.

It is difficult to make meaningful comparisons between the poetry of Dunbar and the poetry of Chaucer, since the differences are so much more interesting. But since Dunbar has been so often categorized as a Chaucerian, it is necessary to consider the reasons that have been given, other than that two of his poems are related to two of The Canterbury Tales. Denton Fox, in his "Scottish Chaucerians" essay, singles out two kinds of indebtedness to Chaucer, neither of which he admits is very susceptible to measurement. First, there is the affinity of technique:

On the technical level, Dunbar's sophisticated metrics, rhetorical devices and diction surely descend, in part, from Chaucer..... One could be precise, and point to certain words and stanzaic forms which Dunbar borrowed from Chaucer, or very often from Lydgate, but the more important part of the debt is more intangible: Dunbar's prevailingly syllabic metrics, for instance, and his willingness to accept into his poetry rhetorical figures and learned words.¹⁹

Secondly, there is an indebtedness in terms of genre:

A large number of Dunbar's poems are written in Chaucerian genres: allegorical poems about spring and love, dream-visions, moral lyrics, and witty

begging poems.²⁰

(By Chaucerian genres are meant those which Chaucer helped to "naturalize" in English.)

Dunbar's indebtedness to Chaucer is not, however, of the "immense" proportions that Fox suggests. The search for words which have a demonstrable origin in Chaucer's poetry produces a result which is woefully disproportionate to the effort involved. Pierrepont Nichols estimates that Dunbar borrows about twenty-five words from Chaucer, but this small tally does not take into account the fact that words found for the first time in English in Chaucer's poems also occur in the work of Dunbar's Scottish predecessors and contemporaries. For example, of the words in Nichols's list, "dispone" occurs in the Bruce, "consequent", "constant", "gyde" (vb.), and "ignorant" in The Kingis Quair, and "habitacioun", "mavis", and "pultrye" in poems by Henryson. The willingness to accept rhetorical figures and learned words may argue an appreciation of Chaucer's flexible approach to language and style in the broader sense, but it is impossible to be any more specific than this. All medieval poetry, after all, demonstrates the use of rhetorical figures, and Dunbar's use of "learned" language is arguably closer to the practice of Lydgate. Dunbar's "high style" - as illustrated by poems such as The Goldyn Targe and Ane Ballat of Our Lady - is more elevated and more sustained than Chaucer's elevated style, just as Dunbar's scurrilous "low style" - in the Tretis and the Dance of the Sevin Deidly Synnis - has no Chaucerian equivalent. In

terms of language, Dunbar is perhaps closest to Chaucer in his willingness to move from one register of language to another within the same poem, and in his use of an easy middle style, which is best described as a heightened form of polite speech. It is, however, difficult to make many meaningful comparisons in specific terms, since Dunbar's subject matter is for the most part radically different from Chaucer's.

The poems which Mackay Mackenzie groups as "Moralisings" are written in this middle style, and in terms of both style and subject matter at least one of them, Of the Warldis Vanitie (No.75), invites comparison with one of Chaucer's exercises in the same genre, Truth (Balade de Bon Conseyl). Both are short refrain poems on the theme of transience, written in language which has a simplicity and spareness appropriate to the subject matter. The tone is best described as one of reasoned exhortation:

Flee fro the prees, and dwelle with sothfastnesse,
Suffyce unto thy good, though it be smal;
For hord hath hate, and climbing tikelnesse,
Prees hath envye, and wele blent overal... (Truth, 1-4)

O wreche, be war! this warld will wend the fro,
Quhilk hes begylit mony greit estait;
Turne to thy freynd, beleif nocht in thy fo,
Sen thou mon go, be grathing to thy gait... (OWV, 1-4)

Metaphorical language is chosen for its eloquence at an immediate level rather than for its complexity, and the fact that both poems exhort their audiences to recognize that life is a pilgrimage through the desert, with its goal the heavenly home, suggests that Dunbar may have had Chaucer's poem in mind as he wrote:

Her is non hoom, her nis but wildernesse:
 Forth, pilgrim, forth! Forth, beste, out of thy stal!
 Know thy contree, look up, thank God of al.. (Truth,
 17-19)

Walk furth, pilgrame, quhill thow hes dayis lycht,
 Dres fra desert, draw to thy duelling place;
 Speid home, for quhy anone cummis the nicht..(OWV, 9-11)

(The Kingis Quair manuscript indicates that Truth was current in Scotland toward the end of the fifteenth century.)

Despite the coincidence of theme, language, and tone, however, it is necessary to be cautious about adducing indebtedness. Both poems belong to a well-worn poetic genre, and the problem of borrowing is further complicated by the fact that the Boethian image of the lines quoted above is also used by Lydgate in his Testament: "Go eche day onward on thy pylgrymage,/ Thynke howe short tyme thou hast abyden here;/ Thy place is bygged aboue the sterres clere.." (892-4).²² Dunbar's lines are, however, closer to Chaucer's than to Lydgate's.

Fox is right to assert that Dunbar's metrics are, like Chaucer's "prevailingly syllabic" and regular. The patterns of sound in Dunbar's poetry are many and varied, however, and Chaucer makes no comparable attempt at metrical diversity. Within any one of Dunbar's poems, there is a fixed number of syllables per line (although occasional variation is permitted), and it is common for them to divide naturally into half-lines, with four primary stresses in each line. Scott, who has discussed Dunbar's metrics in careful detail,²³ comments that they illustrate a particularly successful reconciliation of the native tradition of stress

in measure with the Romance tradition of syllabic measure.²⁴
 The same kind of reconciliation takes place in Chaucer's poetry, and the easy, natural movement of Dunbar's lines frequently produces an effect which is reminiscent of Chaucer. Compare, for example, these passages, one from The Thrissil and the Rois, the other from the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women:

In 'bed at 'morrow // 'sleiping as I 'lay,
 Me 'thocht Aur'ora // with, hir 'cristall 'ene,
 'In at the 'window // 'lukit by the 'day,
 And 'halsit 'me // with 'visage pail and 'grene.. (8-11)

To 'hem have 'I // so 'gret affeccioun,
 As 'I seyde 'erst // whanne 'comen is the 'May,
 That 'in my 'bed // ther 'daweth me no 'day
 That 'I nam 'up // and 'walkyng in the 'mede.. (F, 44-7)

Chaucer's example was probably an instructive one for Dunbar, but it is difficult to put forward a theory of simple indebtedness because the practice of other Scots poets is similar. The syllabic regularity, the implied half-line division, and the four stress pattern may all be traced in The Kingis Quair and the poetry of Henryson, for example, although of course their practice shows the influence of Chaucer. It is difficult to determine to what extent Dunbar is directly influenced by Chaucer, and to what extent by his fellow poets in Scotland. His use in several poems of the four stress couplet is eight syllable lines seems to indicate an affinity with Wyntoun and Barbour rather than with Chaucer.²⁵ The choice of subject matter frequently results in a movement which has no Chaucerian equivalent: the incantatory quality of some of the religious poems, the imitation of dance rhythms in The Lament for the Makaris and Of a Dance in the Quenis Chalmir, and the "cuttit"

effects of the Tretis and the Flyting come immediately to mind. The Chaucerian rhyme royal stanza form which features in three of Dunbar's poems is used also by James I and Henryson, and his practice may have been influenced by theirs.

Dunbar is, as I have tried to show, more independent of Chaucer in respect of the language, movement, and form of his poetry than Fox has suggested. His choice of genres affords, if anything, even less evidence of indebtedness to Chaucer. Chaucer undoubtedly did much towards naturalizing forms such as the dream vision allegory and the petitionary poem, but the Scots poet was writing a full century after Chaucer's death, by which time these genres had become thoroughly conventional in British poetry. It is tempting to believe that Dunbar quite systematically set about showing his mastery of as many as possible of the late medieval genres, exhibiting his familiarity with them by twisting their conventions to serve some surprising ends. Some of his work belongs to genres which were not used at all by Chaucer (localized satires and celebrations, religious lyrics), and although both use the dream vision form, Dunbar's brevity and compression has little in common with the discursive and leisurely Chaucerian manner. What is more interesting as a probable instance of indebtedness is the use, in The Thrissil and the Rois, of a technique which belongs to the dream vision genre - the poet as dreamer and recorder of events. In this poem, written to commemorate the union of the Scottish thistle with the English rose in the marriage of James to Margaret Tudor, Dunbar represents

himself as one who is reluctant to rise from his bed in May to perform the poet's duty of "indyting" when urged to do so by the lady who personifies the season:

"Quhairto," quod I, "sall I uprys at morrow,
For in this May few birdis herd I sing?
Thai haif moir caus to weip and plane thair sorrow,
Thy air it is nocht holsum nor benyng.." (29-32)

Like Henryson in the opening of the Testament, Dunbar is doing more here than simply highlighting the difference between the literary climatic ideal and the reality of the Scottish Spring. The primary effect of his reluctance, and the fact that May binds him to his promise "for to discryve the Ros of most plesance", is to distance the poet from the idealized celebration of the vision. The note of disquiet is sounded again at the end of the poem, when he reports that he awoke "halflingis in affrey". There is a parallel to this way of providing a counterpoise to the harmonious celebration of the dream in the Chaucerian manner of withdrawal in The Parlement of Foules. There, too, the poet is awakened by the "shoutyng" of the birds, and his hope to find "som thyng for to fare/ The bet" has the same effect of suggesting the distance between the ideal dream world and the world of waking reality. Chaucer's technique is well adapted to the subject matter of The Thrissil and the Rois: Dunbar uses it to give an edge of complexity to what would otherwise be what Fox describes as poetry of "statement" and "surfaces".²⁶ Just as the Scottish landscape and climate cannot, even in Spring, live up to the ideal of the locus amoenus, so too James IV cannot be the ruler of the just and harmonious kingdom portrayed in Nature's heraldic pageant.

The connections between Dunbar and Chaucer which I have discussed suggest that the Scots poet responded to Chaucer's work as to a challenge. The affinities between the Tretis and the Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale, and between Sir Thomas Norny and Sir Thopas are sufficient to suggest that the poet was probably inviting his audience to make comparisons between his achievement and Chaucer's. In this respect his poetic practice complements his praise of Chaucer in The Goldyn Targe, where he "quho redis rycht" is indirectly invited to recognize that Dunbar himself has a strong claim to be considered as the "rose of rethoris all". The challenge offered by the two English poems is one to which Dunbar rises extremely well, by writing works which show the same degree of inventiveness in the handling of traditional genres. Dunbar makes no attempt (in the manner of James I or of Henryson in the Testament) to assimilate Chaucer's "voice" or tone, and his poetry is in many ways quite different from Chaucer's. The differences are in part accounted for by the choice of certain non-Chaucerian genres, stanza forms, and metrical patterns, but these are unimportant compared with the divisions of tone and spirit. Dunbar is much more direct than Chaucer: this is apparent in his choice of more concise, less discursive poetic structures, in his fondness for moralizing and admonitory poetry, and in a general preference for statement over the allusive, juxtaposing Chaucerian way of presenting "sentence". (This is not to suggest that Dunbar's poetry is devoid of subtlety: The Thrissil and the Rois and The Goldyn Targe, for example, are more complex, less "aesthetic",

than criticism has usually allowed.) Although both place a high value upon humour, Dunbar's range of comic and satiric effects excludes Chaucer's more delicate ironies and is much more insistently topical. Chaucer's "churles tales" leave no doubt that he appreciated the raucous and the extravagant, but Chaucer would probably have been aghast at the suggestion that farcical vulgarity might have a place in a poem addressed to the king or queen (cf. Complaint to the King, To the Quene). As we read Dunbar's poetry we have the impression, as we do when we read Chaucer, that he "was at the centre of affairs, and at the heart of society, very much an 'insider', not an 'outsider'".²⁷ It is equally clear, though, that the tastes of the two audiences must have been very different, that James and his courtiers appear to have enjoyed abrasive forms of entertainment - for example, the flyting and various other forms of outspoken satire - which would have been considered indecorous at the court of Richard II.

It can hardly be emphasized too strongly that although a few of Dunbar's poems reflect both knowledge and appreciation of Chaucer's work, the differences between them are of more interest than the similarities. Among Middle Scots poets, Dunbar holds no monopoly of invention, but inasmuch as his work combines high technical standards with a flair for adapting traditional forms and techniques to the expression of distinctive and original points of view, Dunbar may be considered along with James I and Henryson, as a true successor of the "worshipful" fader and first foundeur and

embellissher of ornate eloquence in our Englissh".²⁸ The fact that Dunbar's poetry is of such high quality prompts association with Chaucer rather than with Lydgate, but this should not prevent us from seeing that Dunbar found Lydgate's work sufficiently interesting to borrow some of its themes, motifs, and stylistic devices. Dunbar is in no sense a disciple of Lydgate: to see this one has only to set his work beside that of his English contemporary Stephen Hawes, who imitates Lydgate's uniformity of tone, his diffuse syntactic structures, his use of "cloudy fygures" of allegory, and even his prolixity. Nichols's study, while acknowledging Dunbar's "original genius", concludes that "as far as direct influence alone is concerned, he might well be called a 'Scottish Lydgatian'" rather than a "Scottish Chaucerian".²⁹ Taken together, however, the instances of Dunbar's borrowing from Lydgate, including a few which are unnoticed by Nichols, are no more significant than the use which he makes of two of The Canterbury Tales.

Nichols's argument is based mainly on the fact that a considerable number of Dunbar's poems belong to genres which Lydgate had used before him. Both write short satirical pieces directed at particular individuals or occupational groups, following them up with ironical palinodes: the poems addressed to James Doig (Nos. 33, 34) and to the tailors and soutars (Nos. 58, 59) have Lydgatian equivalents in the Ballade on an Ale-Seller and Ballade per Antiphrasim.³⁰ Both write short didactic poems which incorporate refrains and catalogues: Dunbar's "Moralisings" (Nos. 66-77) and

How Sall I Governe Me? (No. 9), for example, are comparable with A Wicked Tunge Wille Sey Amys and most of the other poems which MacCracken characterizes as "little homilies with proverbial refrains".³¹ Again, both write occasional poetry (Dunbar's To Aberdein, To the City of London, Lydgate's Henry VI's Triumphal Entry into London), and works of religious celebration (Dunbar's Ane Ballat of Our Lady, Lydgate's Ave Regina Celorum). As Ronald D.S. Jack points out in a much more recent article, most of the instances of indebtedness which Nichols cites "amount to little more than this - a working within the same traditions, but a different handling of those traditions",³² but there are nevertheless a few verbal correspondences sufficiently close to show that Dunbar does occasionally use Lydgate as a source. Jack draws attention to these two passages which describe the physical attributes of man, the first from Of Deming (No. 8), the second from A Wicked Tunge Wille Sey Amys:

- (1) Be I bot littill of stature,
 Thay call me catyve createure;
 And be I grit of quantetie,
 Thay call me monstrowis of nature;
 Thus can I not undemit be. (26-30)
- (2) 3if thow be fatte owther corpolent,
 Than wille folke seyn thow art a grete glotoun,
 A deuowrer or ellis vinolent;
 3if thow be lene or megre of fassioun,
 Calle the a negard yn ther oppynyoun,
 3itte suffre hem speke and triste right wel this,
 A wicked tonge wille alwei sei a-mys. (43-9)

The common subject matter, together with the use of a pro and contra arrangement, do suggest that the Scots poet knew Lydgate's lines, although the differences of effect are more revealing than the similarities. The Scots passage is much

sharper in outline than the English: the syntax is tighter, and the use of the short line makes the "answering" effect more striking, giving the effect of an exasperated speaking voice. The use of the first person instead of the second also contributes to a gain in immediacy.

Jack supports Nichols's contention that there is a direct relationship between The Lament for the Makaris and three of Lydgate's poems, Timor Mortis Conturbat Me,³³ the Daunce Machabree,³⁴ and the Testament.³⁵ The verbal parallels indicated by Nichols are not close enough to demonstrate conclusively that Dunbar did borrow from Lydgate, and the question of indebtedness is complicated by the traditional nature of the material. Lydgate's Timor Mortis is not the only English lyric with that refrain (although Dunbar's poem is closer to it in form and style than to the other "timor mortis" poems),³⁶ and his Dance of Death is a translation from some French mural verses which may also have been known to Dunbar. It is, however, legitimate to regard Lydgate's poems as sources, if only because of their typicality. The likelihood that Dunbar knew other works in the same genres should be kept in mind, but it is reasonable to assume that Lydgate's poems are sources, even if only because they represent their genres so well. Since neither Nichols nor Jack attempts this, it may be useful to indicate briefly how Dunbar draws upon and combines various kinds of source material to create a new poem which differs markedly from all of them. The Lament draws upon three kinds of didactic poem on the theme of the imminence of death: the

mortality poem in which the speaker is an old or sick man, the meditation which uses a liturgical refrain (exemplified by Lydgate's Timor Mortis), and the danse macabré. Critics have been slow to recognize the connections between Dunbar's poem and the first of these. Scott, for example, insists that "it is some specific private experience which starts him off on the use of traditional material".³⁷ This may be so, but it is more likely that Dunbar drew his inspiration from literary tradition. Lydgate's Testament, one of several Middle English meditations in which the narrator is characterized as an old or sick man,³⁸ contains some lines which are very similar to Dunbar's introduction:

Among other, I, that am falle in age,
Gretly feblysshed of old infirmite.. (197-8)

I that in heill wes and gladnes,
Am trublit now with gret seiknes,
And feblit with infermite..

Dunbar's conclusion makes it clear that, like Lydgate, he is writing a poem whose significance is public as well as private:

Sen for the deid remeid is none,
Best is that we for dede dispone,
Eftir our deid that lif may we;
Timor mortis conturbat me.

This "moralite" is expressed more concisely and memorably than its counterpart in Lydgate's Timor Mortis:

Enpreente this mateer in your mynde,
And remembre wel on this lessoun,
Al wourldly good shal leve be hynde,
Tresour and greet pocessioun.
So sodeyn transmutacioun
Ther may no bettir socour be
Than ofte thynke on Cristes passioun
Whan timor mortis conturbat me.

(It will be apparent that Dunbar's use of "we" avoids Lydgate's awkward transition from second person address to the

me of the refrain.) The most obvious resemblance between Lydgate's Timor Mortis and The Lament is the insistent refrain drawn from the Office for the Dead: in both poems the Latin line contributes authority and sonority, and Dunbar uses it to gain the additional effect of imitation of the steady Totentanz rhythm. The second similarity is the extensive use of catalogue. Lydgate begins with the proposition that there would have been no timor mortis but for Adam's transgression, and proceeds to give a long list of the Biblical figures whom Death has claimed - Noah, Melchisedek, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, Joshua, Gideon, Samson... To this he adds the Nine Worthies, and some heroines from the Bible and romance - Hester, Judith, Candace, Alceste, Dido, Helen, Marcia, Penelope... In all, the list occupies some fifty lines (38-86). Dunbar replaces Lydgate's list of familiar biblical and literary figures with a much more specific and localized kind of catalogue, a roll-call of poets, many of whom must have been well-known to his audience. It is carefully arranged to produce a powerful cumulative effect, beginning with the triad of English poets, going on through the company of deceased Scottish makars to Walter Kennedy "In poynt of dede", and concluding with the poet's own timor mortis:

Sen he hes all my brethir tane,
He will nocht lat me lif alane,
On forse I man his nyxt pray be;
Timor mortis conturbat me.

This sharp personal fear is increasingly felt as the poem proceeds beyond the lines,

I se that makaris among the laif
Playis heir ther pageant, syne gois to graif. (45-6)

There is no comparable sense of involvement and personal relevance in Lydgate's poem, in which the first person is used only in the first stanza, "So as I lay this othir nyght", and in the Latin refrain.

The central thematic and structural feature of the Dance of Death, as it is represented by Lydgate's poem, is the figure of Death claiming all kinds of people from all the ranks of society. Death addresses each of them in turn, and their replies acknowledge the inevitability of their fate. Pearsall comments on Lydgate's translation that what he "had to do for once coincided with what he could best do. There is no need for any development of ideas, no narrative, no exposition, only variation, reiteration, insistence on the call of death and man's reply, a prolonged and varied antiphon - 'You must die': 'I must die'".³⁹ Literary criticism has a limited relevance to Lydgate's work, since the lines on the printed page are divorced from their visual complement, the mural painting of the characters involved in the dance. The paintings on the cloister walls of the Pardon churchyard must have been very large in scale, given the large number of participants in Lydgate's dance: presumably the mural was much like the ceiling decoration of the Lady Chapel at Roslin, which shows some twenty-three figures, some of whom are accompanied by a skeleton.⁴⁰ The figures in the St. Clair chapel are not accompanied by inscriptions, but their very existence suggests that other versions of the Dance of Death, written as well as visual, may have been known to Dunbar.

Lines 17-44 of The Lament show the influence of the conventional Dance of Death poem most clearly, although Dunbar does not use the normal quasi-dramatic arrangement of stanzas into claim and reply. He replaces it with a description of Death's activity, one which makes an effectively controlled use of parallelism and the list:

On to the ded gois all Estatis,
Princis, Prelotis, and Potestatis,
Baith richo and pur of al degre;
Timor mortis conturbat me.

He takis the knychtis in to feild,
Anarmit under helme and scheild;
Victour he is at all mellie;
Timor mortis conturbat me.

That strang unmercifull tyrand
Takis, on the moderis breist sowkand,
The bab full of benignite;
Timor mortis conturbat me.

He takis the campion in the stour,
The capitane closit in the tour,
The lady in bour full of bewte;
Timor mortis conturbat me. (17-32)

Given the comprehensiveness of Lydgate's list, it is hardly surprising that there should be some overlapping with the Scottish one: both include knight, baby, captain, lady, and clerk. Of rather more interest are Lydgate's "scientists" - the astronomer, the magician, and the physician - who correspond to Dunbar's,

Art-magicianis, and astrologgis,
Rethoris, logicianis, and theologgis...

In medicyne the most practicianis,
Lechis, surrigianis, and phisicianis... (37-8, 41-2)

The resemblances may be wholly coincidental, but it is possible that Dunbar expanded the English list in the direction of those "servitouris" who enjoyed the particular favour of the King of Scotland. Rather surprisingly, in

view of his usual preference for the general and the universal, Lydgate departs from his original at one point to include a real person at the court of Henry V. After claiming the minstrel, Death turns to

Maister Jon Rikelle some tyme tregetowre
Of nobille harry kynge of Ingelonde.. (st. 65)

It is perhaps just possible that this piece of local detail in the Daunce Machabree may have given Dunbar the idea for his list of poets dead and about to die.

The borrowings from literary tradition as it is represented by Lydgate's poems are combined with original subject matter - the list of poets - and incorporated into a powerfully original poetic structure. The Lament portrays an inexorable movement from the universal to the particular and personal: it begins with a general statement about "the stait of man", illustrating this with the examples of several kinds and ranks of humanity. Emphasis is placed on those courtiers who are also men of learning, from whom it is an inevitable step to the poets and to a poignantly understated treatment of the ars longa, vita brevis theme. The poem stresses the mortality of poets very clearly, but there is also an implied contrast between the poets and the "estatis" mentioned earlier. Poets, unlike even the most learned or valiant courtiers, have the opportunity to create something which defeats Death and oblivion and hence to ensure the perpetuity of their names: The Lament enacts this by naming them and no one else. Dunbar's proud boast in the Remonstrance to the King - "Als lang in mynd my wark sall

hald... As ony of thair warkis all" (28-33) - comes immediately to mind, but in The Lament confidence in this measure of immortality is heavily outweighed by the personal fear of death. In the second last stanza the poet speaks as Death's next victim - "On forse I man his nyxt pray be" - and the imminence of the mocking figure of Lydgate's poem is keenly felt. The poem does not end here, though: in the last stanza the personal meditation merges into a subtle form of didacticism by its use of the first person plural - "Best is that we for dede dispone". The rhetorical stragem is the same as that which underlies the presentation of the speaker in a contemporary English mortality lyric:⁴¹

I wende to dede, clerk full of skill,
 þat cowthe with wordes men mate & styлле.
 So sone has þe dede me made ane end -
 Bes war with me! to dede I wende.

In The Lament, the powerful evocation of the poet's timor mortis prompts his audience to identify strongly with him, and hence to be inclined to accept his advice about the need to "dispone" for death. There is nothing in the poetry of Lydgate, not even the avowedly autobiographical Testament, which is remotely comparable with the fusion of the individual and the universal in The Lament. The poetic traditions represented by the three Lydgate poems are an integral part of the construction of Dunbar's poem, but their combination, together with the subject matter which gives the work its title, are unmistakable signs of invention. It is hardly necessary to add that the impact of The Lament is enhanced by its conciseness and the firm control over language, syntax, and form. With delightful understatement, Nichols

introduces his list of "parallels" between The Lament and the Lydgate poems by warning that "allowance must be made for the fact that Lydgate is habitually prolix, Dunbar very succinct".⁴²

Dr. Jack suggests that Lydgate's antifeminist satire The Pain and Sorrow of Evil Marriage may be considered as an influence on the Tretis, one just as strong as that of the Wife of Bath's Prologue.⁴³ There is a possibility that the Scots poet may have borrowed a few of his details from Lydgate's ponderously jocular piece of moralizing - the images of the birds and the pilgrimage, the concluding address to young men - but these are so slight and so conventional in nature that the question of indebtedness must remain open. The case for borrowing from Chaucer is considerably stronger. Jack is on safer ground when he turns to the echoes of Lydgate's Reson and Sensuallite in The Goldyn Targe. Here several details from Lydgate's long, almost encyclopaedic, allegorical work come together: the use of colours, the image of the dew, the treatment of Nature and the description of her mantle, the ship, and the musical catalogue.⁴⁴ By itself, any one of the parallels would be unimportant, but the combination of details, in passages which have a similar moral and thematic colouring, does seem conclusive. Dunbar almost certainly used Lydgate's poem (and the Roman de la Rose) as a storehouse of details for his own infinitely more compact allegory, but Jack's theory that the composition of Dunbar's list of deities (73-9) can be explained by the poet's cursory reading of a much longer

account in Reson and Sensuallyte (1029-1844) is questionable. The basis of the theory is the assumption of a gaffe on Dunbar's part - i.e., the implication that Pallas and Minerva are separate goddesses, the inclusion of Thetis in their company ("Thetes, Pallas, and prudent Minerva", 78) and the presence of Apollo (75). This assumption of "mythological error" is unwarranted. I suggest that there is an error in line 78 of Chepman and Myllar's print of the poem, which was repeated by Bannatyne: i.e., that the order of three words has been confused, and that the line should read,

Thetes, and prudent Pallas Minerva.

There is no "problem" about "the presence of Thetis in such august company".⁴⁵ Dunbar may perhaps have been inspired by Lydgate's mention of this minor goddess to include her in his poem, but her presence is particularly appropriate because of her association with the sea. There is nothing incongruous about the presence of Apollo among the ladies, providing that Dunbar's emphasis on the quality of blinding light is fully appreciated: the ship containing the company is seen coming from the east, "agayn the orient sky" (50), with the top of its mast "brycht as the stern of day" (52), while the ladies are further associated with the sun by the comparison with the "flouris that in May up spredis" (59). The inclusion of Apollo in the list is both a way of continuing the emphasis on light and of suggesting the link between feminine radiance and sexuality. (Earlier in the poem Phoebus and Aurora are described as lovers.) Both implications are again present in the "masculine" simile which concludes the stanza:

Thir mychti quenis in crounis mycht be sene,
Wyth bemys blith, bricht as Lucifera. (80-81)

Apart from the fact that Dunbar's list may be seen to make quite good sense, it is by no means certain that any of its components were taken from Reson and Sensualllyte. In the first place, there is no actual "list" at all: lines 1029-1844 are an account of the genealogy and attributes of the three goddesses, and it is difficult to understand why any intelligent poet should choose to pick out a selection of its proper names. Moreover, Dunbar can hardly have culled the name "Apollo" from Lydgate's poem when Lydgate uses "Phebus" (1036).⁴⁶ The notion that Dunbar did not know that Apollo was Phoebus, to whom there is reference earlier in the poem, is just as improbable as the notion that he made a distinction between Pallas and Minerva.

Close examination indicates, then, that the list in The Goldyn Targe is not connected in any way with Reson and Sensualllyte. It has seemed necessary to discuss the matter in some detail because the latest criticism of the Targe has accepted without question Jack's suggested explanation of a supposed gaffe on the part of the poet.⁴⁷ Elsewhere in the poem there is, however, evidence of borrowing from Lydgate. It has not been observed that Dunbar draws on Reson and Sensualllyte a second time, for a few details in The Thrissil and the Rois. There, as in the Targe, there is the image of Nature's mantle,

Me thoct fresche May befoir my bed upstude,
In weid depaynt of mony divers hew.. (15-16)

This seems to have been derived from Dame Nature's mantle

"Wrought of foure elementys" (351). Dunbar's May, like Lydgate's Nature, visits the poet in his chamber, illuminating it with her radiance (TR 21, RS 214-24), and from Reson and Sensuallyte seems to have been developed the idea of the goddess's chastisement and instruction of the poet figure. May addresses him as "slugird", bidding him "awalk anone for schame", and to participate in the spirit of the Spring morning by writing something in her honour. Lydgate's Nature says,

My childe .. thou art to blame,
And vn-to the yt is gret shame,
Thy self so longe to encombre,
Thus to slepe and to slombre
This glade morwe fresh and lyght.. (445-9)

She is more high-minded than Dunbar's goddess, pressing on her poet the "occupacioun" of right living rather than the writing of a mere poem. In The Thrissil and the Rois the poet's reluctance to perform his task is Dunbar's own invention, and it contributes, as I have explained, to an effect which is more characteristic of Chaucer than of Lydgate. As in the borrowings for The Goldyn Targe, Dunbar takes a few details from Lydgate, altering them to accord with his own thematic purpose. Lydgate's Testament, where these lines occur among a description of the Spring landscape:

May among monethes sitt like a quene,
Hir suster Apryll watryng hir gardeynes
With holsum shoures shad in the tender vynes.. (329-31)

seems to have been used in a similar way, when we compare the portrait of May in The Goldyn Targe:

There saw I May, of myrthfull monethis quene,
Betuix Aprile and June, her sistir schene,
Within the gardyng walking up and down.. (82-4)

This is an interesting instance of Dunbar's occasional

tendency to take an image from Lydgate, to sharpen and refine it, and to replace it in a setting which is more brilliant than the original one.

The aureate mode in which several of Dunbar's poems are written probably owes something to one aspect of Lydgate's style. Aureation is an intensely self-conscious manner of expression, characterized by a stylized, artificial kind of language and imagery (frequently Latinate and polysyllabic), and by elaborate syntactic structures. The tribute to the trio of English poets at the end of The Gold-yn Targe, which indirectly praises its own virtuosity, exemplifies both characteristics of the style very well. Another important locus of Dunbar's "celicall" effects is nature description in the Targe and The Thrissil and the Rois, and some of these lines recall the way in which Lydgate handles the same convention. The fact that nature description is a topos in late medieval dream vision and allegorical poetry makes caution necessary in the matter of positing sources, but the following passage from the Targe does seem to owe something to The Flower of Courtesy, which is also one of the lesser sources of The Kingis Quair:

Anamalit was the felde wyth all colouris,
The perly droppis schake in silvir schouris,
Quhill all in balme did branch and levis flete;
To part fra Phebus did Aurora grete,
Hir cristall teris I saw hyng on the flouris,
Quhilk he for lufe all drank up wyth his hete. (13-18)

The corresponding lines in Lydgate's poem are:

And yet I was ful thursty in languisshyng;
Myn ague was so feruent in his hete
Whan Aurora, for drery complaynyng,
Can distyl her chrystal teeres wete

Vpon the soyle, with syluer dewe so swete,
 For she durste, for shame, not apere
 Vnder the lyght of Phebus beames clere. (36-42)

The parallels are sufficiently close to suggest indebtedness on Dunbar's part: both use the metaphor of the Aurora-Phoebus relationship, with the dew as Aurora's tears, both use gemmate vocabulary ("cristall" and "silvir"), and both play on the relationship between moisture and heat, with the use of "swete" as a rhyme word. Lydgate's language and imagery are elegant examples of their kind, but Dunbar manages to sharpen his model and make it even more expressive. In the first two lines he describes the dew-covered foliage, emphasizing its crisp freshness by placing "perly" and "silvir" in the same line, and by the alliterating "s" sounds. The metaphor which follows is neatly linked with the description: the "flouris", at both a literal and a metaphorical level, are the natural development from "branch and levis". Dunbar shows the relationship between the dawn goddess and the sun in a different light: Lydgate's Aurora weeps "for shame", but in the Targe her tears are those of parting, which her lover acknowledges by drinking them with his "hete". Beside this ingenious and evocative image, the lover's tears of Lydgate's poem appear pallid and conventional. The elaborate descriptions of Nature in the Targe and The Thrissil and the Rois may be seen as part of a conscious attempt to "outdo" the achievements of Lydgate within the same rhetorical mode. Comparison between short extracts can illustrate the greater degree of mannerism in Dunbar, but not the increase in the scale of his effects: for example, the lines from The Flower of Courtesy, quoted above,

constitute the poem's only stanza of pure description, whereas in the Targe there are some seven stanzas devoted to the setting.

Like Lydgate, Dunbar uses the polysyllabic high style in poems of celebration, both secular and religious. The Ballade of Lord Bernard Stewart, for example, has a counterpart in the Ballade to King Henry VI upon his Coronation, and Ane Ballat of Our Lady is related in both subject matter and style to Lydgate's Ave Regina Celorum.⁴⁸ Pearsall observes that Lydgate's Marian poems "represent the highest development of his mannered art, with lavish use of stylistic artifice, elaborate aureation and a virtually static syntax based on the invocation Ave".⁴⁹ Since both hymns make reference to the Ave Maria, and since there are other lyrics of the same general kind, it is not possible to state with any certainty that Dunbar used Lydgate as a source.⁵⁰ Even though indebtedness cannot be assumed, it is surely reasonable to suggest that in writing his poem Dunbar was trying to outshine with the brilliance of his own effects the known English exercises in the genre of the aureate hymn. The similarities - the "hayle" repetition, exclamation, the heavily Latinate vocabulary, the complex rhyme scheme - are apparent when we set Dunbar's lines beside Lydgate's:

Hale, sterne superne! Hale, in eterne,
In Godis sicht to schyne!
Lucerne in derne for to discerne
Be glory and grace devyne;
Hodiern, modern, sempitern,
Angelicall regyne!
Our tern inferne for to disperne

Helpe, rialest rosyne.
Ave Maria, gracia plena!
 Haile, fresche floure femynyne!
 Yerne us, guberne, virgin matern,
 Of reuth baith rute and ryne. (Ane Ballat, 1-12)

Hayle luminary & benigne lanterne,
 Of Ierusalem the holy ordres nyne,
 As quene of quenes laudacion eterne
 They yeue to thee, O excellente virgyne!
 Eclipsyd I am, for to determyne
 Thy superexcellence of Cantica canticorum,
 The aureat beames do nat in me shyne,
Aue regina celorum! (Ave Regina Celorum, 1-8)

The difference is one of intensity of effect. The Scots poem is more exclamatory, an effect reinforced by the variation in line length, and the incantatory effect produced by the insistent rhymes of the English work is heightened by the incorporation of internal rhymes. Ave Regina Celorum lacks the thrusting, forward movement of most of Dunbar's stanzas: each of them concludes with a statement, a pause before the next series of triumphant exclamations. Even more striking is the proportion of Latinate words in the Scots poem. Metham, who commented on Lydgate's "halff chongyd Latyne",⁵¹ would no doubt have been appalled by a line such as "Hodiern, modern, sempitern".⁵² Like Lydgate's Marian hymns, Ane Ballat of Our Lady respects the decorum of a particular kind of occasion, and its combination of fervour and solemnity is wholly appropriate to a celebration of the Virgin. Scott underestimates the devotional value of the poem by describing it as "the poetry of sheer lovely verbal noise for its own sake".⁵³ By pressing the resources of language to the very limit beyond which intelligibility begins to disappear, Dunbar creates what is at once the most virtuous and the most moving example of

the religious hymn in the aureate style.

Dunbar's use of a particularly elaborate form of high style is the most important aspect of his technical debt to Lydgate. It is necessary to see that the indebtedness is a matter of improvement and further refinement rather than one of imitation. Further, it is necessary to see the Lydgatian influence in perspective: aureate effects are predominant in only a handful of Dunbar's poems, and as an element of style they are less prominent than his pervasive use of alliteration in passages which use a heightened form of colloquialism. Jack attempts to show that Lydgate's poetry exerts a more pervasive influence on Dunbar's writing than it actually does.⁵⁴ Admittedly Dunbar uses a variety of amplificatory techniques - "doubled" words and phrases, intensifiers, parallel phrases and constructions, double negatives - but these are so general in late medieval poetry that Dunbar's method clearly reflects knowledge of the style of a great deal of earlier poetry, English, Scots, and French. The fact that Dunbar's effects are not as ponderous or as repetitive as Lydgate's tend to be indicates merely that he is a better craftsman. Jack's claim that Dunbar is, in spite of his moderation in the use of amplificatio, the follower of Lydgate,⁵⁵ is impossible to justify. Dunbar's attitude towards Lydgate's poetry seems very close to that of his exact contemporary in England, the "laureate" Skelton. Both use the aureate language which Lydgate made so popular, and both have some works which bear a generic relationship to part of Lydgate's vast output.

Their work is, however, more varied and more lively than Lydgate's, and they do not attempt such heroic labours as the Troy Book and the Fall of Princes. These differences aside, both Dunbar and Skelton seem to respect Lydgate's poetry. Skelton's praise is never so fulsome as the tribute at the end of The Goldyn Targe, but he does include Lydgate in the English contingent at the Palace of Fame. In Phyllip Sparowe, Jane acts as a spokesman for the poet when she makes this comparison between Chaucer and Lydgate:⁵⁶

Also John Lydgate
Wryteth after an hyer rate;
It is dyffuse to fynde
The sentence of his mynde,
Yet wryteth he in his kynd,
No man that can amend
Those maters that he hath pende;
Yet some men fynde a faute,
And say he wryteth to haute. (804-12)

Dunbar is not so outspoken, yet the differences between his own practice and that of Lydgate suggest that he too chose not to imitate the Monk of Bury's particular brand of "hautness" and diffuseness.

Certainty about the relative importance of Chaucer and Lydgate's work as sources for Dunbar's poetry is impossible to reach. The number of likely instances of borrowing from Lydgate is probably greater than the number from Chaucer, but against this their occasional and sporadic nature, together with Dunbar's unfailing power to transcend his sources, must be taken into account. I have suggested that the Tretis and Sir Thomas Norny may reflect a desire on Dunbar's part to rival Chaucer in his treatment of similar

subject matter. The same kind of competitive impulse seems to be at work in poems such as The Lament for the Makaris, The Goldyn Targe, and Ane Ballat of Our Lady, in which Lydgatian effects are concentrated and refined to produce new and more impressive effects. Dunbar's selectivity in borrowing from the English poets to whom he pays tribute is so great that the terms "Chaucerian" and "Lydgatian" have a limited relevance to his poetry.

Chapter VII

Skelton and Scottish poetry.

In the preceding chapters I have tried to show the various ways in which Scots poets of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries - James I, Henryson, Douglas, and Dunbar - used their knowledge of earlier English poetry to enrich their own "making". It is quite clear that these poets saw nothing incongruous about borrowing and adapting from the literature of a country with which Scotland shared what was at best only an uneasy peace throughout the period.

There is no real incongruity, however, when we recall that the "auld enemies" shared a language, and that the English poetry upon which they drew is quite detached from political realities. The subject of this chapter, Skelton's borrowing from Scottish poetry, is a much more extraordinary tribute to the power of poetry to transcend national and political loyalties. Skelton, unlike the Scots poets named above, was a vehement nationalist, who apparently lost no opportunity to vent his spleen on the Scots. The poems written to commemorate the defeat of James IV by Surrey's forces at Flodden, Against the Scottes, are so mindlessly vicious that they aroused the hostility of some English readers at the time of their publication. The laureate's answer to his critics in the last poem of the group is devastatingly simple: those who dare to rebuke him are the enemies of the king (35-8). Howe the douty Duke of Albany, written nearly ten years later to celebrate August Surrey's victory over Albany, repeats the jingoistic fervour of the Flodden ballads:

Ye Scottes all the rable,
Ye shall neuer be hable
With vs for to compare...

(177-9)

Even when his subject matter involves him in no direct frontal attack on the Scots, Skelton mocks their "rudeness" through crude imitations of Lowland dialect:

Twit, Andrewe, twit, Scot,
Ge heme, ge scour thy pot.. (Why Come Ye Nat to
Courte?, 122-3)

Hop Lobyn of Lowdeon wald haue e byt of bred..
(Speke, Parrot, 74)

It is hardly surprising, in view of this animosity towards the northern kingdom, that no Scots poet is accorded a place in that "great nowmber of poetis laureat of many dyuerse nacyons" in The Garlande of Laurell, yet there is good reason to believe that Scots poetry influenced some of Skelton's writing.

Although there is widespread agreement that the poetry of the makars shows in various ways the influence of earlier English poetry, modern criticism has been strangely reluctant to concede the likelihood that Skelton borrowed from Scots poetry. The barrier appears to be Skelton's comments about the Scots as a race. C.S. Lewis, for example, observes that there is something "faintly like Skeltonics" in the metre of some Scottish poems, but immediately discounts the possibility of direct influence: "Skelton himself would rise from the grave to bespatter us with new Skeltonics if we suggested that he had learned his art from a Scotchman".¹ There is good reason to believe that the verbal missile which Lewis alludes to - the Skeltonic - was in fact developed from a Scots work, the first fitt of the anonymous burlesque poem Colkelbie Sow, preserved in the Bannatyne MS.²

There can be absolutely no doubt about the priority in time of the Scots poem. In The Palice of Honour Douglas refers to "auld Cowkewyis sow" (1712), which is evidence that the poem was in existence by 1501: E.F. Guy, who has edited the poem, suggests a date of ca. 1490.³ Guy discusses the affinities between the Skeltonic as it is used in Elynour Rummyng and the style of the first part of Colkelbie Sow: my own views, reached quite independently, tend to support his.

One of the dominant themes of Skelton criticism in this century has been the nature and origins of the Skeltonic, that verse form whose effects are so well defined and imitated by Robert Graves in a tribute to "helter-skelter John",

How his pen flies about,
Twiddling and turning,
Scorching and burning,
Thrusting and thrumming,
How it hurries with humming,
Leaping and running... (John Skelton, 22-7)

The Skeltonic line tends to be short, usually with two or three stressed syllables and a variable number of unstressed syllables. Other characteristics are sustained rhymes, parallelism and repetition, and alliteration. Various theories have been advanced to explain the ancestry of the form. I.A. Gordon suggests that the Skeltonic is the product of the breaking into two parts of the Anglo-Saxon alliterative line, transmitted via the fourteenth century alliterative revival.⁴ In William Nelson's view, the Skeltonic is a development of medieval Latin Reimprosa, the form of Skelton's own Latin prose treatise, the Speculum

Principis.⁵ H.L.R. Edwards looks also to Latin literature, but to rhymed verse rather than to prose, drawing attention to the virtuoso lines which begin the Devout Trental for Old John Clarke.⁶ Skelton's Latin lines are indeed similar in style and spirit to the English lines which follow them, and for this reason alone it would be rash to deny the validity of the Latin model which is proposed. Nevertheless, it is worth remembering Edwards's comment on Gordon's theory, that "the nature of literary growth" is that "a new verse form, like a new animal, has more ancestors than one".⁷ I suggest that in Colkelbie Sow Skelton found a vernacular model for effects of a similar kind to those which he had found in his reading of classical and medieval Latin. The similarities between Elynour Rummyng and the first fitt of Colkelbie are too close to be convincingly explained by Lewis's theory that each may be a descendant of some earlier body of poetry, now lost.⁸ (It is hardly credible that these hypothetical poems could have escaped the notice of sixteenth century poets and commentators.) Modern Skelton criticism has tended to regard Elynour Rummyng as one of the first pieces in the Skeltonic style. Gordon's chronology places the poem in 1508, the same year as Phyllyp Sparowe, and only Edwards and Pollet have argued for a later dating. Edwards argues (on no evidence at all) that the ale-wife of Skelton's poem is meant to be identified with Jane Scrope in middle age,⁹ and Pollet suggests that the poem should be dated after 1518 because of verbal parallels to later poems and a topical reference.¹⁰ The "verbal parallels" argument is attractive until it is remembered that Skelton

quotes in Magnyfycence from The Bowge of Court, written some eighteen years before, and the topical reference (to a brawl in Cheapside) is so general as to carry no weight at all. Elynour Rummyng can be safely accepted as an early poem, and there is no reason why it should not have been written during Skelton's first period in London - i.e. before 1502.

All of the stylistic features of Elynour Rummyng are to be found in the first fitt of Colkelbie. By itself, any of the resemblances would not be sufficient to prove indebtedness, but the clustering of parallels is surely conclusive. Both poems are written in short lines which feature two (and occasionally three) heavy stresses, with a variable number of unstressed syllables: Guy comments that "though the number of beats per line of the first fitt of 'Colkelbie's Sow' may vary from two to four, the line can often be read as containing two strong beats, while the other beats, where they occur, may be regarded as secondary",¹¹ and the same is true of the metrical pattern of Elynour Rummyng. If this were the only parallel, the resemblance could be convincingly explained as two quite independent instances of adaptation of the old alliterative line. This theory breaks down, however, when the incidence in both poems of strings of rhymes is taken into account. This is an example of the Scots poet's fondness for ostentatious rhyme effects: the lines are from the guest list for the harlot's banquet:

On apostita freir
 A peruerst perdonair
 And practand palmeir
 A wich and a wobstare

A milygant and a mychare
 A fond fule a fariar
 A cairtar a cariar
 A libbar and a lyar....

(52-9)

In all there are some forty words in this list which rhyme in "air". The effect is intentionally humorous - we see it again in the description of the rustics' dances:

Maister myngeis the mangeis
 Maister tynges la tangeis
 Maister totis la toutis
 And rousy rottis the routis
 Maister Nykkis la nakkis
 And Schir Iakkis la Iakkis..

(341-6)

In Elynour Rummyng Skelton attempts this same kind of verbal humour: e.g.,

This ale, sayde she, is nopy;
 Let vs syppe and sopy
 And not spyll a droppy
 And so mote I hoppy,
 It coleth well my croppy.

(557-61)

Both poets are careful to separate their giddy strings of rhymes with couplets.

A related kind of verbal humour is the extensive use of parallelism in both poems, an apparently endless progression of lines which have the same structural form. These lines are part of the description of the rustics' dances in Colkelbie:

Sum trottit tras and trenass
 Sum balterit the bass
 Sum perdowy Sum trolly lolly
 Sum cok crow thow quhill day
 Sum lincolne sum lindsay.....

(300ff.)

Skelton uses the same kind of "sum.. sum" construction in Elynour Rummyng: e.g.,

Some brought walnutttes,
 Some apples, some peres,
 Some brought theyr clyppynge sheres,

Some brought this and that,
 Some brought I wote nere what,
 Some brought theyr husbandes hat,
 Some podynges and lynkes
 Some trypes that stynkes.

(437-44)

The similarity here is reinforced by the shared fondness for lists of objects, and by the similarity of mood. In Elynour Rummyng, as in the first fitt of Colkelbie, parallelism and sustained rhymes are used to imitate the scenes of giddy activity which are described. The throngs of animals and humans which go to rescue the piglet, and the revelling peasants, have their counterparts in the swarms of women who sample the dubious delights of Elynour's ale-vat. In Elynour Rummyng alliteration is used sporadically to promote the sense of uncontrolled movement and hence to enrich the verbal humour: e.g.,

Some huswyves come vnbrased,
 With theyr naked pappes,
 That flyppes and flappes,
 It wygges and it wagges,
 Lyke tawny saffron bagges.

(134-8)

Effects of this kind recur throughout the Scots poem: e.g.,

And ilk bore and ilk beist
 Defoulit the fulis of the feist
 Sum mokit menzeit & merrit..

(190-92)

The above quotation from Elynour Rummyng also illustrates the Skeltonic technique of piling up words of similar sound and meaning. Of this Nelson remarks "Phrase begets phrase, and clause, clause, each in its kind. If he 'chides', then he 'chatters', he 'prates' and he 'patters'; he 'clitters' and he 'clatters'..."¹² Precisely the same kind of parallelism is to be found in Colkelbie: as well as the last line of the quotation above, note the following example,

mony laddis mony lownis
 knowf knois kynnys culrownis
 Curris kenseis and knavis
 Inthrang and dansit in thravis.. (349-52)

The stylistic features discussed here - the short line with two or three stresses, rhyme-runs, alliteration, parallelism of various kinds - are of course characteristic of other poems in the Skeltonic style. Elynour Rummyng is, however, much more directly related to the Scots poem because of its "low-life" subject matter and its imitation of "hurdy-gurdy" physical movement. The influence of Colkelbie on poems such as Phyllyp Sparowe and Colyn Cloute is at best an indirect one, the result of Skelton's extension of the Colkelbie style into other forms of composition. Guy suggests that "the list of birds which come to Philip Sparow's requiem is in much the same vein as the list of reprobrates who come to feed on the pig",¹³ but this overlooks the delicate mock-solemnity of Skelton's account.

There are resemblances between Colkelbie Sow and Elynour Rummyng which have no specific connection with the Skeltonic as it occurs in Skelton's other poetry. For example, there is the use which both poets make of lists of proper names. The Scots poet individualizes the members of the porcine company who go to rescue the pig - "Wrottok", "Writhneb", "Hogy", "Baynell", "Sigill Wrigill" - and soon after there follows the list of their owners,

Gilby on his gray meir
 and fergy on his sow fair
 hoge hygin be pe hand hint
 And symy that was sone brint
 Wt his lad loury...

(210ff.)

Similarly, Elynour's customers are introduced by name,

Thyther cometh Kate,
Cysly, and Sare.. (118-19)

And than came haltyng Jone.. (326)

Than thyder came dronken Ales.. (351)

Than sterte in mad Kyt.. (412)

The result is a busy, riotous effect, whose nearest visual equivalent is one of Breughel's crowded human landscapes.

In Colkelbie Sow there is little to distinguish the swine from their owners. The swine, like the humans, are named, and the names are very similar: for example, "Hogy" (163) has his human counterpart in "Hoge" (212), and the swineherds have as their captain "Sweirbum with his snowt" (277). There is a literal enough herd of pigs in Skelton's poem (169-86), and it is surely no coincidence that here, too, the human rioters are three times identified with swine: "lyke a rost pygges eare" (20), "Than swetely together we ly/ As two pygges in a sty" (233-4), "Garnyshed was her snout" (554). The effect in both poems is to emphasize the animal tendencies of human nature, but in Skelton there is a sense of revulsion which has no place in the Scots poem. Elynour Rummyng is mentioned in the Garlande of Laurell, together with a piece entitled "The Gruntyng and the Groynninge of the Gronnyng Swyne" (GL, 1376). This work has not survived, but its title suggests that it too may have been related to Colkelbie Sow.

There is an important structural similarity between Elynour Rummyng and the first fitt of the Scots poem.

Colkelbie Sow is divided into blocks of matter which correspond to the various "caissis", each of which is concerned with a particular type of activity. After the introduction comes the account of the harlot's "mangery", then the attack of the pigs, followed by the chase of the owners, the revelries, the battle, and a short account of the subsequent career of the piglet. There is almost no narrative progression: the poet's interest is not so much in telling a story as in verbal humour, the imitation in words of the hurly-burly scenes described. The only concession to narrative coherence is an occasional introductory comment about the next block of "matere": e.g.,

Is not this a nyce caiss
 Bot 3it a fer werss it waiss
 A new noyment and nois
 Wt a rumour vprois.. (194-7)

And 3it this is a strange caiss
 Bot eftirward .. (437-8)

Elynour Rummyng has the same kind of static quality. Skelton is more interested in evoking a sense of chaotic activity than in developing narrative, and he too divides his material into structural blocks, introduced by comments such as "Nowe in cometh another rabell" (382), and "Another sorte of sluttis" (436). Both poems are set within a framework of oral delivery: Skelton begins with the traditional minstrel's call for silence, and the Scots poem purports to be an entertainment suitable for a feast. Elynour Rummyng, like the whole tale of Colkelbie (which includes the stories of the other two pennies) is divided into fitts.

The author of Colkelbie Sow gives his own commentary

on its prima pars. He insists that he has written in order to appease his "awin spereit" (64), and at the beginning of the next fitt apologizes for "thir mokking meteris and mad matere". Skelton ends his poem with a similar apologia,

I have wrytten too mytche
Of this mad mymmynge
Of Elynour Rummynge.

(619-21)

The resemblances between the two poems do point to direct influence of one upon the other, and since Colkelbie Sow is the earlier there can be no doubt about the direction of the indebtedness. Despite the similarities of style and subject matter, there is one important tonal difference between Skelton and his model. The comedy of the Scots poem is comedy of words rather than comedy of manners, and we smile with the poet when at the end he points the moral "That oft of littill cumis mich" (476). Elynour Rummyng, on the other hand, is to a lesser extent a poem of sheer verbal fantasy. Skelton's poem is a piece of antifeminist satire, an indictment of the degeneracy and intemperance of women. In his survey of Skelton's poetry, Pollet suggests that the inspiration for the subject matter of Elynour Rummyng, a riotous assembly of women in an ale-house, came from "an old fifteenth century poem, a Gossips' meeting".¹⁴ The verbal parallels between the two poems are sufficiently close to indicate that one is indeed indebted to the other (in terms of subject matter rather than of style),¹⁵ but it is more likely that the anonymous satire is indebted to Skelton's poem. Pollet relies for his dating of the poem on Thomas Wright's totally unsupported claim that it and the manuscript which contains it were composed in the fifteenth

century.¹⁶ The collection of poems, Balliol MS. 354, is part of the Commonplace-Book of Richard Hill (which contains the Scots poem To the City of London), and this was compiled during the period 1508-36.¹⁷ Even if it could be shown that the ballad antedates Skelton's poem, this could not undermine my view that the first fitt of Colkelbie Sow is the major source of Elynour Rummyng.

Another of Skelton's works, the Poems against Garnesche, is indebted to a Scots composition, The Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie. Again, there can be absolutely no doubt that the Scots work is the earlier. The Flyting was in existence by 1508 (when it was printed by Chepman and Myllar), and M.P. McDiarmid puts a convincing case for a date of composition as early as 1490.¹⁸ The satirical emphasis which Skelton places on Garnesche's knighthood in the first poem of the series leaves no doubt that it was composed after 1513, the actual time at which that honour was conferred on Henry VIII's erstwhile gentleman-usher.¹⁹ Skelton's poems are only one half of a flyting proper: regrettably, Garnesche's initial challenge and his subsequent poems have not survived. It is the first instance of this bizarre form of court entertainment in English, and in both form and style its Scots inspiration is apparent. The flyting is essentially a contest or duel of abuse, in which one poet challenges another by insult and awaits a reply. In The Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie, each antagonist has the support of a "commissar", or second: Sir John Ross sides with Dunbar, "Quinting" (possibly Quentin Shaw) with Kennedy.

In the English contest, Garnesche has the assistance of one "Greasy Gorbellied Godfrey", although the laureate Skelton answers his challengers unaided. The presence of the poet's assistant is also characteristic of the French serventois and jeu-parti,²⁰ but the Scots poems differ from these and from other forms of medieval abuse poetry in their sheer intensity of effect, the pell-mell accumulation of epithets and other varieties of insult. In tone and style Skelton's poems are much closer to the Scots flyting than to other forms of streitgedicht. They are linked too by their "occasion" as court entertainment. The Flyting contains allusions which are clearly directed at a court audience: for example, each poet refers to the others's supposed offences against the royal house, and Kennedy pleads for the intervention of his "Hye Souverane Lorde" (481-2). Skelton protests as he takes his leave that he would have exercised his talents in other ways, "But for to serue the kinges entent/ Hys noble pleasure and commandemnt" (177-8). Each of his poems has the note "By the kynges most noble commaundment". It is possible that one of Henry VIII's contacts at the Scottish court - his sister, for example - recommended the flyting as an interesting and novel diversion.

Friedrich Brie, in his extensive pioneering study of Skelton's poetry,²¹ recognizes that the Poems against Garnesche show the influence of the Dunbar-Kennedy flyting. His work contains a list of more than twenty verbal "parallels" between the two groups of poems. Only a handful of these are close enough, however to suggest borrowing: e.g.,

Garnesche

Ye solem Sarsen, alle blake
ys your ble. (I, 36)

In the pott your nose dedde
sneuyll (III, 27)

Auaunt, rybawde, thy tung
reclame (IV, 106)

Dunbar and Kennedie

Thy cheik bane bair, and
blaiknit is thy ble (165)

I schout, 'apon that snowt
that snevillis (550)

And leif thy ryming, rebald,
and thy rowis... (32)

Renunce, rebald, thy rymyng,
thow bot roysis.. (54)²²

The essence of Skelton's use of The Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie rests not in specific verbal borrowings, but rather in imitation of its techniques. Like Dunbar and Kennedy, Skelton refrains from using his sharpest missiles at the beginning of the attack. Dunbar begins his side of The Flyting with a general statement of his complaint against Kennedy and Quentin. The pace is quickened by Kennedy's rejoinder, which begins the attack proper with a swift burst of alliteration:

Fantastik fule, trest weill thow salbe fleyit,
Ignorant elf, aip, owll irregular,
Skaldit skaitbird, and commoun skamelar.. (35-7)

Skelton's first two poems use alliteration for scurrilous abuse, but he follows the Scots in keeping his attack at a relatively impersonal level at the beginning. Dunbar's second poem expands upon his opponent's infamy: Kennedy is a highland traitor, who would have poisoned "our Lordis cheif" in Paisley, he is a beggar, a stealer of hens.... Kennedy retaliates by attacking the traditional English sympathies of his opponent - Dunbar is the worst kind of traitor, and a pardoner and coward into the bargain. Kennedy's attacks on Dunbar's cankered ancestry have their counterpart in Skelton's third poem, where he sneers at

Garnesche's lowly origins:

Whan ye war yonger of age,
Ye war a kechyn page,
A dyshwasher, a dryvyll,
In the pott your nose dedde sneuyll. (III, 24-7)

(This apparently brought retaliation, for in the last poem Skelton begins a fresh attack with the question "Dysparage ye myn auncetry?" IV, 63.)

It is important to observe that the English poem follows the Scots flyting in balancing specific personal criticisms with torrents of more general abuse which are outrageously unrealistic in their effect. Note, for example, the following:

Of all prowde knauys thow beryst the belle,
Lothsum as Lucifer lowest in helle.
On that syde, on thys syde thou dost gasy,
And thynkyst thy selfe Syr Pers de Brasy,
Thy caytyvys carkes cours and crasy,
Moche of thy maneres I can blasy. (Garnesche, IV,
27-32)

Judas, jow, juglour, Lollard laureate;
Sarazene, symonyte provit, Pagane pronunciate,
Machomete, manesuorne, bugrist abhominabile,
Devill, dampnit dog, sodomyte insatiable.. (Flyting,
524-7)

Skelton's allegations against Garnesche probably bear no more relation to reality at this point than the wild charges which the Scots hurl at one another. The Garnesche poems echo the vigorous scatological language of The Flyting. Skelton never equals the Scots at their best in this vein (Flyting, 110-12, 449-72), but he must be given credit for a brave attempt (III, 62-5; IV, 18). Skelton attempts a pun on his opponent's name,

I wold sum manys bake ink horne
Wher thi nose spectacle case;
Yt wold garnyche wyll thy face, (IV, 133-5)

object of a flyting match was to prove superior skill with words.) Dunbar disdains his opponent's taste and literary heritage - "Sic eloquence as thay in Erschry use" (107), and Kennedy rises to a spirited and witty defence which fulfils his earlier threat to attack with "laureat lettres" (28),

I perambalit of Pernaso the montayn,
 Enspirit wyth Mercury fra his goldyn spere;
 And dulcely drank of eloquence the fontayne,
 Quhen it was purifit wyth frost, and flowit cleir.
 (337-40)

Skelton is contemptuous of Garnesche's poetic ability ("Ye lernyd of sum py bakar" - III, 111) and in the last poem there is the charge that his rhymes are too scurrilous and insufficiently varied,

Ye rayl, ye ryme, with, Hay, dog, hay!
 Your chorlyshe chauntynge ys all o lay.
 Ye, syr, rayll all in deformite:
 Ye haue nat red the properte
 Of naturys workys, how they be
 Myxte with sum incommodite... (IV, 5-10)

It is possible that Skelton is mocking here a composition which was even closer to The Flyting than his own poems are. "Hay, dog, hay" may allude to the Scots makars' tendency towards short periods and internal rhymes. Certainly Skelton's own style has a different kind of variety (one of verse form), and is less insistently scurrilous than the Scots invectives. (This does not imply, of course, that Skelton's are the better poems.) On the subject of his own poetry, Skelton turns from the unashamed exaggeration of The Flyting to a different kind of inflation. He boasts about his laureation, but even more about his position as royal tutor,

The honor of Englund I lernyd to spelle,
 In dygnyte roialle that doth excelle. (IV, 95-6)

Skelton was of course tutor to one or both of the sons of Henry VII, but he neglects to mention that he was discharged when after Arthur's death in 1502 Henry became heir to the throne.²³ In his introductory sortie, Dunbar threatens "to raise the feynd with flytting", and throughout both he and Kennedy strain language to its limits to produce the effect of diabolical incantation. In fairness to Skelton, though, it should be said that he does as well as he can with a language that lacks the richness and variety of Scots in this vein.

Elynour Rummyng and the Poems against Garnesche are the only two of Skelton's poems which indicate indebtedness to Scottish poetry. There are more general links between the work of Skelton and Dunbar, links which do not suggest actual borrowing by one poet from the other, and in the following pages the more important of these will be discussed. It was once popular to regard Dunbar as a Scottish Skelton²⁴ (although strangely enough no one seems to have thought of calling Skelton an English Dunbar), and there are definite similarities between their work, both of subject matter and style. The most obvious parallels are similar exercises in traditional genres. For example, Dunbar and Skelton both practised occasional poetry, secular and religious, which is in the traditions of Lydgate's occasional poetry, written some seventy years earlier. Dunbar's Elegy on the Death of Bernard Stewart, for example, is in the sober and elevated vein of Skelton's commemoration of the death of Northumberland. Both wrote short devotional

poems in the fashionable aureate mode (although Dunbar's great hymns of celebration have no real counterpart in Skelton) and both practised the short courtly love address: Dunbar's To a Ladye and Quhone he list to Feyne are comparable with Skelton's The Auncient Acquaintance, Madam, and Knolege, Aquayntance, Resort. On the other hand, both poets attack women: Womanhod, Wanton, Ye Want and Elynour Rummyng resemble The Tretis and Of the Ladyis Solistaris at Court in this respect.

It is interesting to compare the ways in which Skelton and Dunbar develop the allegorical inheritance of the earlier Middle Ages in two poems, The Bowge of Courte and The Goldyn Targe. Skelton's poem, as its title suggests, is about the perils which beset the would-be courtier, while Dunbar's is about the perils of sensuality. Despite the difference of subject matter, the poems are alike in that they use the traditional dream vision form to make complex statements about fear and alienation. In both poems, the effect is developed through the manner of the poet's self-depiction. The "action" of Dunbar's poem is contrivedly formal and stylized, and this throws into sharp relief the poet's cry of despair when his ally is overcome: "Quhy was thou blyndit, Resoun? quhi, allace!" (214). The poet's fear of irrational sensual love is reinforced by the first reference to the ship - "As falcoun swift desyrrouse of hir pray" (54) - and by the violent "crak" which brings his vision to an end (243). Dunbar's "I" does not correspond directly to any of the customary allegorical abstractions

of courtly poetry. Because he is so unwilling, he is not like the Amans of the Rose, and there is a strange sense of distance between him and Reason, his ally in the psychomachia. If he can be labelled at all, it must be as Fear or Dread. Skelton's allegory is less allusive and considerably more realistic, yet the poem conveys a sense of menace which is remarkably reminiscent of Dunbar. Skelton's persona is described more fully than the protagonist of The Goldyn Targe, yet he has the same passiveness, the same inability to take decisive action. One of the most original aspects of the poem is the allegorical role assigned to the poet, that of Drede, but Skelton differs here from Dunbar only in being more explicit. The conclusion of The Bowge of Courte is similar in content and mood to the scene in The Goldyn Targe which precipitates the poet's awakening; both, it is interesting to note, involve the idea of attack and the image of the ship. These poems are very different from Chaucer's dream visions. In his self-depictions, Chaucer too manages to create the effect of estrangement - and sometimes also of fear - but his work differs from Dunbar's in being more realistic and more leisurely, and from Skelton's in showing a different balance between description and dialogue. Chaucer's genial humour and self-depreciation are quite foreign to Dunbar and Skelton alike. Dunbar may have known Skelton's poem (which by 1500 had been printed by Wynkyn de Worde), but in view of the differences of subject matter and style it seems hardly likely that one work influenced the other.

At a more personal level, Dunbar and Skelton are alike because of their sensitivity about social and professional status, a sensitivity which leads to attacks upon lesser spirits. Both nod in the direction of the conventional humility pose (The Goldyn Targe, 271-9, The Bowge of Courte, 18-21), but maintain an intense pride in their position as court poets. Dunbar's part in The Flyting and Skelton's Poems against Garnesche illustrate this very clearly. Dunbar of course did not have an official laureateship to flaunt (it is fortunate there is no equivalent in his poetry to The Garlande of Laurell and Calliope) but his complaints and petitions often reflect a very real sense of injured professional pride. Like Skelton, Dunbar is quick to attack anyone who dares to cross him on the field of poetry, and his strongest weapon is scorn. The Complaint to the King Againis Mure - about a poet who dared to meddle with Dunbar's making - is very similar in mood to Skelton's Agaynste a Comely Coystrowne. Skelton's lines,

Yet bere ye not to bold, to braule ne to bark
At me, that medeled nothyng with youre wark, (61-2)

suggest that the poem may have had an occasion similar to that of Dunbar's poem. Both poets make their resentment of upstarts and interlopers plain. Some of Dunbar's most spirited poetry springs from an aristocratic indignation about the activities of particular individuals (Damian, Norny, Donald Owre) or of whole groups of "courtmen". Skelton attacks the unnamed "coystrowne", Garnesche, Dundas, Gaguin, and the Cambridge heretics Bilney and Arthur. His greatest single enemy was of course Wolsey, and as time

went on he became increasingly outspoken in his criticism of Henry's Chancellor. In Why Come Ye Nat to Courte? he makes no attempt to disguise his anger that a man of "greasy genealogy" should have forgotten how he had been raised through the power of the king (475-504). Skelton is uncompromisingly vicious towards enemies of the state, and although Dunbar's poetry is never rabidly patriotic there is one work, the Epelaphe for Donald Owre, which rivals Against the Scottes in its crude mockery of a defeated enemy. Dunbar's feeling for Gaelic speakers was probably closely akin to Skelton's feeling for the Scots.

The talent for mockery which both poets possess is well employed in parody. Phyllyp Sparowe and The Dregy of Dunbar are related in being witty parodies of the liturgy. Skelton makes a thorough exploitation of the Office for the Dead and the Requiem Mass in his mock-heroic poem about the death of a pet, while Dunbar uses the Matins from the Office for the Dead to express his horror at the rigours of court life away from Edinburgh. There is a clear similarity of spirit between the two poems, although Gordon is right to observe that Skelton's method - word by word adherence to the services - is not the same as Dunbar's.²⁵ Again, there is a marked resemblance between the epitaphs for John Clarke and Adam Uddersall and The Testament of Mr Andro Kennedy. Skelton's poems are burlesques of conventional memorials of the dead, and like their models they are written predominantly in Latin. All the worst attributes of the two citizens of Diss are embellished, and in the Trental for

Clarke particular attention is paid to the drinking habits of the deceased:

Fratres, orate
 For this knauate,
 By the holy rode,
 Dyd neuer man good:
 I pray you all...
 With, fill the blak bowle
 For Jayberdes sowle.
Bibite multum:
Ecce sepultum
Sub pede stultum...
 With hey, howe, rumbelowe.. (44-55)

The speaker in Dunbar's poem would be remembered for his bibulousness:

A barell bung ay at my bosum,
 Of warldis gud I bad na mair;
Corpus meum ebriosum,
 I leif on to the toune of Air;
 In a draf mydding for ever and ay
Ut ibi sepiliri queam,
 Quhar drink and draff may ilka day
 Be cassyne super faciem meam.. (33-40)

The Testament is of course not vicious in the way that Skelton's poems are, since presumably it was written during the lifetime of its subject.

In an essay on Dunbar's range as a stylist, J. Leyerle draws attention to the presence of two widely divergent modes or voices in his poetry - at one extreme the heightened colloquialism of The Flyting and the Tretis, at the other the finely wrought aureation of The Goldyn Targe and some of the hymns - and makes the comparison with Skelton's range.²⁶ It is true that Skelton's poetry does move between these same polarities of poetic language, but it must be added that he does not handle either mode as successfully as Dunbar does. The Scots poet's "low" style is more vigorous

and more varied, and it is always accompanied by a sense of the poet's presence as a speaking (or shouting) voice. Skelton's colloquial effects tend to dissipate themselves because they are continued for so long: Colyn Cloute, Why Come Ye Nat? and Elynour Rummyng all tend to become repetitive after a hundred lines or so, and the sustained use of short lines does little to maintain the reader's interest. At the other extreme, Skelton's aureate style never reaches the virtuoso brilliance of The Goldyn Targe or Ane Ballat of Our Lady. The description of the "herber" in The Garlande of Laurell (651-78) lacks both the pictorial appeal and the rich accretion of varied images which characterize Dunbar's treatment of the locus amoenus in The Goldyn Targe, or the similar passages in The Palice of Honour. A characteristic of Skelton's style is the arrangement of stylistic effects into blocks, with the result that long works such as The Garlande of Laurell and Speke, Parrot are really amalgamations of shorter poems. There is no equivalent to Dunbar's apparently effortless transitions from one tone, from one range of language to another, within a single work. (Consider, for example, the brilliant fusion of courtly and flyting styles in the Tretis, and the unobtrusive marriage between "anamalit termes celicall" and homely colloquialism in The Goldyn Targe.)

Even if Dunbar was sometimes prompted to write out of resentment or hurt pride, his poetry always exhibits a sense of balance and control which is frequently lacking in Skelton's work. His political pieces - the poems directed at

Wolsey and the abuse of power in general - struggle to create their own formal laws, and the result is often shapelessness and repetitiveness. Skelton's style is to a large extent a product of his zeal for redressing evils in the body politic. At the beginning of Colyn Cloute, for example, the short line style asserts itself defiantly:

He cryeth and he creketh,
 He pryeth and he peketh,
 He chydes and he chatters
 He prates and he patters.. (19-22)

The cryptic and heavily allusive manner of most of Speke, Parrot, which is a barrier to complete interpretation of the poem, is justified by the poet as a defence against his enemies:

No matter pretendyd, nor nothyng enterprysed,
 But that metaphora, allegoria with all,
 Shall be his protectyon, his pauys, and his wall. (206-8)

Criticism and mockery there certainly must have been, but Skelton defends himself haughtily: those who presume to find fault with his work are ignorant, "churlysshe currys of kynde" (297). Dunbar is not a political poet, and although just as proud of his poet's calling as Skelton, he is much more considerate of his audience, probably because they were frequently present as listeners. His poems of complaint and satire, just as much as the poems of celebration, are concise and clear, exhibiting the true craftsman's concern for finish and formal elegance. C.S. Lewis observes that Skelton's charm is that of the amateur, whereas Dunbar impresses us as being "the professional through and through".²⁷

There are close affinities between the English and the

Scots court poets, affinities of spirit and of poetic technique. Both respect the poetic forms of the earlier Middle Ages (and the conservative Catholic spirit contained in some of those forms), and both have a talent for satire and mockery which manifests itself in invective and parody. Yet Dunbar's sensibility and artistic powers are in some respects radically different from those of the Tudor laureate. Dunbar's poetry exhibits none of Skelton's vehement nationalism, despite his incisive comments on Scottish court life. His style has much in common with Skelton's - for example, its variation between two poles of eloquence, polite and abusive - but Dunbar shows the craftsman's concern for finish, verbal wit, and subtle variation. One suspects that Dunbar simply would not have understood Skelton's theory of divine inspiration for "poetes laureate", a theory which implicitly disclaims personal intellectual and aesthetic responsibility (A Replycacion, 365-96).

Several editors and critics have observed the similarities between the concluding section of Speke, Parrot, in which the parrot (a thin disguise for Skelton in his role of vox populi) resolves to "Sette asyde all sophysms, and speke now trew and playne", and the Scots poem which has been included in various editions of Dunbar under the title A General Satyre.²⁸ Small and Guy suggest that the Scots poem, which they attribute to Dunbar, is the source of Skelton's lines, but it is almost certain that the indebtedness is in the other direction. The question of the authorship of the Scots poem is obviously of the greatest importance

here. Bannatyne ascribes it to Dunbar,²⁹ and Maitland to Sir James Inglis.³⁰ Inglis was James V's Chancellor of the Chapel Royal until 1529, and the holder of a number of other benefices:³¹ he is mentioned by Lindsay in The Testament of the Papyngo as the author of "ballatts, farses, and.. plesand playis" (41), and the following line, "Bot Culrose hes his pen maid Impotent", is ironically prophetic.

Inglis, newly made Abbot of Culross, was murdered there in 1531.³² None of the objections which Mackay Mackenzie raises to Dunbar's authorship of the poem on internal grounds is very persuasive.³³ There is, for example, very little point in remarking that other satirical pieces by Dunbar have a brisker metre, since Dunbar is such a versatile stylist, and it is simply incorrect to state that internal rhymes are uncharacteristic, since these are part of the technique of The Flyting. Dunbar is a poet of many moods and masks, and there is nothing intrinsically improbable about his championship of "the commoun cawis", or in an attack on foolish nobles: these issues are, after all, raised in the shorter poem Of Covetyce. The allusions in the poem to contemporary events are not sufficiently concrete to prove or disprove Dunbar's authorship: the reference to "king and quene" (68) does not imply a date of composition before Flodden, since Margaret Tudor continued to be styled as "Quene" even after her re-marriage; similarly, the allusion to "judgeis and lordis now maid of lait" (46) may be to either the institution of the Lords of Daily Council in 1504, or of the College of Justice in 1532.³⁴ The persuasive evidence against Dunbar's authorship and a

date of composition before 1513 is concerned with the poem's language, and its reference to contemporary female fashion. The DOST records that "quhene" (14), "mycharis" (31), and "ketchepillaris" (66) are not found elsewhere in written usage until after 1550. In itself the linguistic evidence is not conclusive, but it is strongly supported by the dates of the styles of costume which the poet deploras. In Bannatyne's text there is a reference in line 71 to "fartingailis" (cf. Maitland "farting stulis"). Historians of sixteenth century costume agree that the vogue for the Spanish hooped skirt reached France and Britain sometime after the mid-1540's.³⁵ In line 73 the poet turns to sneer at "sic fowill tailis, to sweip the calsay clene,/ The dust upskailis". This is clearly reminiscent of the French fashion deplored in Lindsay's Contemptioun (ca. 1540): "thir syde taillis,/ Quhilk throw the dust and dubbis traillis,/ Thre quarteris lang behind thare heillis" (13-15). There is a further reference to the idiom of Lindsay's poem in "Sa mony ane Kittie": Lindsay refers several times to "Kittokis" as prostitutes. The pithy "fucksailis", used to describe a style of high headdress (74) has its first recorded use in Skelton's Colyn Cloute (399).

It is reasonable to conclude that A General Satyre was written not by Dunbar, but by a Scots poet of the 1540's.³⁶ If the author was a "Sir Iames Inglis", as Maitland claims, he cannot have been the poet Inglis to whom Lindsay refers in the Papyngo: Hamer records that there were two other men of that name whose careers can be traced until the

middle of the sixteenth century.³⁷ The identity of the poet cannot be established, but his skill in adapting the English poem is beyond question. The last ten stanzas of Speke, Parrot, which belong to the distinguished genre of the general complaint, list a wide variety of contemporary evils and abuses - self-seeking behaviour on the part of clergy and nobility, disregard of law and religious responsibility, neglect of the poor, extravagance in dress and manners.. It would be wrong to suggest that the Scots poet was indebted to Skelton on the basis of a similarity of subject matter alone. There are, however, parallels of word, style, and structure, which do indicate indebtedness. Both make very effective use of parallelism, specifically of lines beginning with "So many" and "such", and playing upon the antithesis between "so many" and "so few":

- (1) So mony preistis cled up in secular weid,
 With blasing breistis casting thair clathis on breid,
 It is no neid to tell of quhome I mene;
 So quhene to reid the deirgey and the beid
 Within this land was nevir hard nor sene.
 Sa mekle tressone, sa mony partiall sawis,
 Sa littill ressonne to help the commoun cawis,
 That all the lawis ar not sett by ane bene;
 Sic fenyeit flawis, sa mony waistit wawis
 Within this land was nevir hard nor sene. (Gen. Sat.,
 11-15, 26-30)
- (2) Sa many complayntes, and so smalle redresse;
 So myche callyng on, and so small takyng hede;
 So myche losse of merchaundyse, and so remedyles;
 So lytell care for the comyn weall, and so myche nede;
 So myche dowztfull daunger, and so lytell drede;
 So myche pride of prelattes, so cruell and so kene;
 Syns Dewcalyon's flodde, I trowe, was nevyr sene.
 (SP, 463-9)

This kind of patterning is more intensive in the English poem, but the resemblance will nevertheless be apparent.

The sonorous effect of the parallelism is reinforced by the

refrains. In the Scots poem "Within this land was nevir hard nor sene" is used throughout: in the English poem "Syns Dewcalyon's flodde" is constant as the first half of the refrain, although the second half is varied. It is likely that the Scots poet developed his refrain from the two English lines which end "was nevyr sene" and "was nevyr sene nor shall". There are two verbal parallels: "So myche pryde of prelattes" - "Sic pryd with prellattis"; "so fatte quaylles" - "als fatt as quhailis". Both poets give special prominence to the decay in the standards of poetry as a manifestation of the general decay. Skelton's first stanza alludes to the "mad tyme" spent in "new makyng", and in the last stanza of the Scots work there is a lament that there are "So few witty, that weill can fabillis fenye".

The major alteration which the Scots poet makes to his source is to remove its elements of specific personal satire. Although Skelton's last ten stanzas are different in style from the earlier part of Speke, Parrot, they continue the attack on Wolsey as the source of all of society's ills (cf. stanzas 3, 4, 6 and 8). Although the Scots poem does seem to allude at one point to a particular person (13), it is much more general and more wide-ranging in approach: its concern is with the ills of Scottish society in the generation prior to the Reformation. Skelton's poem is altered to create an overall statement which has particular relevance to a Scottish audience. This is apparent not only in the topical references mentioned above, but also in the contemptuous allusion to "halland schekkaris, quhilk at

Cowkelbyis gryce/ Ar haldin of pryce" (56-7).

There is a second, less interesting, Scots adaptation of a poem by Skelton. The thirteen stanzas in Bannatyne's "verry singular ballatis full of wisdome and moralitie", which begin "O god that in tyme all thingis did begin",³⁸ incorporate Skelton's short poem On Tyme. (Sixteenth century editions and a sixteenth century manuscript provide the grounds for the attribution to Skelton.)³⁹ The correspondence between the English and the Scots poem is not exact, but when two verses are compared it becomes very clear that the one is a loose "translation" of the other: e.g.,

Tyme to be sad, and tyme to play and sporte;
Tyme to take rest by way of recreacion;
Tyme to study, and tyme to use comfort;
Tyme of pleasure, and tyme of consolation:
Thus tyme hath his tyme of diuers maner facion:
Tyme for to eate and drynke for thy repast;
Tyme to be lyberall, and tyme to make no wast.
(On Tyme, 10-16)

Tyme to be sad Tyme to plesour and sport
Tyme of study Tyme of gud recreatioun
Tyme to be hevy and Tyme to vse confort
Tyme of displesour and Tyme of consolatioun
Thus tyme hes his tyme of diuerss maner fassioun
Tyme to eit and drink and tyme of pastyme & play
Tyme to be leberall and tyme of delectatioun
Tak tyme quhill tyme is for tyme will away.
(Bann., 65-72)

F.M. Salter suggests that the poem may be from the pen of George Bannatyne himself, but that on the other hand "it is also possible to believe that the poem 'Of Tyme' circulated in Scotland before Skelton was born".⁴⁰ It is very difficult to see why a poet of Skelton's ability should have felt moved to abbreviate such a mediocre and rambling set of verses, and it is inherently much more probable that a six-

teenth century Scots versifier set himself the task of expanding Skelton's concise illustration of the nature of time by amplifying the element of abstract moralizing in the first stanza, and by giving the whole a specifically Christian interpretation. The DOST records that the words "mysvsiit" (62) and "endeveir" (53) were first used after 1550, and this of course reinforces the argument for the priority of the English poem. The expansion of Skelton's short poem is analogous to the sixteenth century revision of Henryson's The Garmont of Gud Ladeis, also in the Bannatyne MS.⁴¹

The Scots poem, like its English model, is an extension into verse of a style of proverbial utterance about the nature of time which probably derives ultimately from Ecclesiastes 3.7:⁴² in the paraphrase of James I,

"All thing has tyme", thus sais Ecclesiaste,
And "wele is him that his tyme wele abit". (KQ 133. 1-2)

There is an interesting parallel to Skelton's extended repetition of "time" in the anonymous mid-fifteenth century Scots prose treatise Dicta Salomonis:

Item he sais that al thyng has a tyme in this warld,
and occupcis a space in maner of pasage; as tyme of
byrth, tyme of ded, tyme of seting and of sawinge,
tyme of scheringe and of gaderinge, tym of vptakinge,
tyme of ded, tyme of lyfe, tyme of seknes, tyme of
heill..⁴³

There are several Scots poems which incorporate proverbs about the nature of time, using this kind of word play. A poem in the first part of the Bannatyne MS. exhorts the faithful to be glad,

for now it is the tyme of grace
 The tyme of penitence and prayeir
 The tyme of conqueiss and of purchase..⁴⁴

The similarity of tone between this and the last stanza of the expanded Skelton poem is quite clear. There is another work in the same anthology which in two stanzas repeats the theme of the longer poem in the same word-juggling style, but without discussion of the uses of time.⁴⁵ Two other poems in the manuscript use time proverbs - "Certane preceptis of gud counsale"⁴⁶ and "A zungman chiftane witles", which occurs in two slightly different forms.⁴⁷ Montgomerie uses proverbial material in The Cherrie and the Slae (21). Verses written on the theme of time, using "time" as a key word throughout, and poems incorporating proverbs about time appear to have been more popular in Scotland than in England, although Skelton's poem is not the only southern example.⁴⁸ It is quite probable that Skelton's poem, in its Scots expansion, contributed to the popularity of this kind of moral poem in Scotland. The tradition culminates elegantly (and fittingly, in view of its mixed ancestry) in Ane Schort Poeme of Tyme, by James VI and I.⁴⁹ Despite its "flowing" style, the matter and the insistent repetition of the following stanza leave no doubt that the king knew at least some of the poems mentioned above:

Then woundred I to see them seik a wyle,
 So willinglie the precious tyme to tyne:
 And how they did them selfis so farr begyle,
 To fashe of tyme, which of it selfe is fyne.
 Fra tyme be past, to call it bakwart syne
 Is bot in vaine: therefore men sould be warr,
 To sleuth the tyme that flees fra them so farr. (22-8)

The Scots borrowings from Skelton are of course of

slighter interest than Skelton's adaptations from Scots poetry. The latter reveal attempts to write new kinds of English poetry by assimilating styles and genres which are part of a separate literary tradition. The mid-sixteenth century Scots adaptations, on the other hand, are from Skelton's poetry at its most conventional. That Skelton's work should have been known in Scotland is hardly surprising, since Spoke, Parrot and On Tyme had both been printed several times by the middle of the sixteenth century. A more interesting question is that of the means by which Skelton acquired his knowledge of Scots poetry, and the form in which he read it. Colkelbie Sow was certainly available only in manuscript, although The Flyting had been printed by 1508. How, then, might manuscript and print have come to Skelton's notice? There are any number of ways in which this might have come about, and I shall mention here only the most likely of them.

Although Dunbar's authorship of the poem To the City of London ("London, thou art of townes A per se") has been questioned, the Treasurer's Accounts make it clear that Dunbar was absent in England at the time of the negotiations for the marriage of the Thistle and the Rose at the end of 1501.⁵⁰ (R.L. Mackie argues convincingly against Baxter's view that the poem was not written by Dunbar.)⁵¹ Skelton was at this time royal tutor, and it is likely that he may actually have met Dunbar. The marriage itself may have provided the opportunity for Skelton to become acquainted with Scots poetry: the Earl and Countess of Surrey escorted

Margaret to Edinburgh and were present at the marriage: in The Garlande of Laurell, Skelton delights in advertising his familiarity with the members of the Howard family. An intriguing instance of Skelton's contact with a learned Scot concerns the period of his position as royal tutor. Skelton was discharged after the death of Prince Arthur in April, 1502, together with an unnamed Scot. The following is an extract from the Queen's privy purse expenses, July 3, 1502:

It^m the same day to the said Lady Bray for money by
 hur given to a Scottishe man scole maister to the
 prince at his departing by the Quenes commaundement
xxs⁵²

Obviously, Skelton and this man must have been colleagues for at least a short time. Diplomatic courtesies between London and Edinburgh were being exchanged frequently at the time, but no Scot could have gained the privileged position of royal tutor without exemplary qualifications. The records are silent about his identity, but Walter Ogilvie, the author of a panegyric addressed to Henry early in 1502, which pays particular attention to the illustrious pedigree of Prince Arthur, is a likely candidate. Ogilvie, the contemporary of George Dundas and a classicist of some renown, may have written the panegyric with the royal tutorship in mind.⁵³ The Scottish records make no mention of his presence in England for this purpose, but this is hardly surprising, since he could have held the position for only a few months.

One of the most interesting of Skelton's "political"

poems about Scotland (a group which includes Against the Scottes and Howe the douty Duke of Albany) is the short piece Against Dundas. Here we see the evidence of an actual poetic confrontation between Skelton and a Scot. In a few terse Latin lines, Dundas alleges that Englishmen have tails, and that for this reason they are "gens sine laude". The second Latin stanza is possibly also by Dundas, although the "Skelton nobilis poeta" at the end seems to indicate that these peppery lines are Skelton's. Whether or not Dundas was being completely serious it is impossible to tell, but the tone of the reply leaves little doubt about Skelton's reaction. He launches into an angry attack on Scotsmen:

Skelton laureat
 After this rate
 Defendeth with his pen
 All Englysh men
 Agayn Dundas,
 That Scottishe asse.. (19-24)

Dundas, dronken and drowsy
 Skabed, scuruy, and lowsy,
 Of vnhappy generacion
 And most vngracious nacion. (50-53)

It is an interesting coincidence that Dunbar uses the legend about the Englishman who pinned a tail to St. Augustine to taunt Kennedy (The Flyting, 125-6): Kennedy, in turn, hurls the gibe back - "Thy forefader.. Throu his tresoun broght Inglise rumplis in" (350-51). Skelton makes a similar kind of counterattack (33-9), in almost the same words as one of the insults thrown at Garnesche. The poem by the Scot and Skelton's reply do not of course meet all the requirements of a full-scale flyting, but nevertheless there is a nice irony in the fact that Against Dundas is related to a genre

which Skelton took over from that "most vngracious nacion".

It is possible that Sir George Dundas, the author of the witty little gibe against the English,⁵⁴ may have provided Skelton with some of his knowledge of Scots poetry. Dundas, a graduate of St. Andrews and later of Montacute College, praised by Boece for his knowledge of Greek and Latin literature, had ties with the English court by virtue of his position as Knight of the Order of St. John.⁵⁵

There was no Scottish "Language" or unit of the order, and in theory the immediate allegiance of its Scottish members was to the Prior of the order in England. Dundas was the nominee of the order in England for the vacant Preceptory of Torphichen, and his struggle for recognition over rival claimants led to his leaving Scotland in 1510, when a safe-conduct was granted by the English king. When he returned in 1515, his opponents (the faction led by Albany) complained that he had been able to travel unmolested through England - clear enough evidence of where his interests lay. Although a prominent member of the pro-English faction under Albany's regency, Dundas was sufficiently patriotic to prepare two thousand men for battle with the belligerent Henry in 1522. The poem to which Skelton replied may well have been written after Dundas left Scotland in 1510, although he must have been in England on at least one earlier occasion. Skelton's gibe "For thou beggest at euery mannes dur" (26) may allude to Dundas's canvassing of support for his claim among members of the Order of St. John in England. (Although it would hardly have been tactful for him to have

written a poem about Englishmen and tails at such a time!)

The emergence of Skelton is the most striking feature of late fifteenth and early sixteenth century English poetry, and his contemporary, Henry Bradshaw, was right to praise him as "inuentiue Skelton".⁵⁶ Certainly his work is very different from that of Hawes and Barclay, those convention-bound plodders in the footsteps of Lydgate. Skelton's habitual defensiveness is perhaps partly the product of a sense of cultural isolation: the complaint of Gower, speaking as one of the triad which includes Chaucer and Lydgate, that the literary fame of England waned "when that we were gone" (The Garlande of Laurell, 406), reflects Skelton's attitude towards the work of his English contemporaries. It would be absurd to suggest that the poets of the northern kingdom were his masters, but it is reasonable to infer that his creative sympathies, if not his political ones, lay with Scots poetry. In this chapter I have discussed two relatively minor, if interesting, Scots adaptations of Skelton's poetry in the sixteenth century. A much more significant borrowing from Skelton is the use which Sir David Lindsay makes of the morality play Magnyfycence for the first part of Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis.

Chapter VIII

Two Aeneid translations: Surrey's debt to Douglas.

No proof can be offered for the hypothesis that the political activities of the Howard family indirectly provided Skelton with a knowledge of Scots poetry. Fortunately it is possible to be more specific about that much more direct Howard connection with the literature of Scotland - the use which Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, grandson of the Flodden victor, made of Gavin Douglas's XIII Bukes of Eneados in his own translations of Virgil's second and fourth books. Douglas's was the first complete translation of the Latin epic into a dialect of English, and it was the only vernacular example available to Surrey. His own translation was not published entire until 1557, and it led the way for other partial translations of Virgil into English: notably Thomas Phaer's Seven first books of the Eneidos (1558), and Richard Stanyhurst's Thee First Foure Bookes of Virgil his Aeneis (1583).

Like Skelton, Surrey saw nothing amiss in borrowing from the literature of a country which Tudor England viewed at best with suspicion, and at worst with armed hostility. (Surrey's presence with his father at Solway Moss in 1542 is probably alluded to in "Spite drave me into Borias raigne".)¹ The sense of the worth of his translation which led Douglas to proclaim,

Throw owt the ile yclepit Albyon
Red sall I be, and sung with mony ane,

was not misplaced. A conservative estimate puts the number of manuscripts in circulation before the Eneados was printed in London in 1553 at ten,² and there were probably many

more. In view of Surrey's close association with the court circle as companion to the Duke of Richmond, it is hardly surprising that he came to know the Scots manuscript. The Bishop of Dunkeld had died an exile in London in 1522, and it is a reasonable assumption that copies of his "bettir part" had been eagerly received by the group of humanist scholars who had close associations with the royal household.³ It is possible that Surrey may have come to know the work through the associations of Margaret Douglas, the king's niece, daughter of Margaret Tudor in her second marriage to the Earl of Angus, who was Gavin Douglas's nephew. Margaret Douglas was a member of the court circle which provided the audience for Wyatt's poetry, and her clandestine marriage to Thomas Howard provoked the king's wrath and her husband's downfall.⁴ Thomas Howard was the uncle of Surrey. English precedent may have influenced Surrey's borrowing from a Scots work. Wyatt's "hand that taught what might be sayd in ryme,/ That reft Chaucer the glory of his witt" had been turned to an adaptation of one of Henryson's Fabillis, and although Wyatt's borrowing from Scots is less extensive and less significant, Surrey may have been guided by his predecessor's example.⁵

There can be no doubt that Surrey drew extensively upon Douglas's translation of Virgil into Scots for his own translation of Books II and IV. In her edition of Surrey's translation, Florence H. Ridley shows quite conclusively that he borrowed extensively from the relevant books of the Eneados: in the text she italicizes those words and phrases

which have been taken over from the Scots, after taking into account that some apparent borrowings may in fact be independent translations from the Latin.⁶ In all, some 880 instances of Surrey's use of Douglas are adduced. Dr. Ridley effectively clarifies and extends the views about Surrey's indebtedness to Douglas which have been advanced by George Frederick Nott and his successors. In 1815 Nott suggested that the English poet had taken from the Scots "almost every turn of expression and combination of words that was worth preserving."⁷ Further, she convincingly questions the plausibility of the arguments put forward by Berdan and others, that (1) one of Surrey's editors may have "scotticized" the work on the basis of his own rather than the poet's reading of the Eneados, and (2) that the similarities between the two translations are to be explained by common use of sixteenth century commentaries such as those of Badius Ascensius and Marius Servius.⁸ The basis of Ridley's text is the version in Tottel's Miscellany, the only text for Book II, but which for Book IV has fewer echoes of Douglas than have the other two extant versions, Day's print (1554) and the Hargrave MS. transcription (1568). She agrees with earlier critics who suggest that Book IV seems less dependent upon the Scots translation than Book II, but the possibility that Surrey's own version of this book contained as many borrowings as the earlier one should also be taken into account.

The frequency with which words, phrases, and even whole lines of the Eneados are echoed in the English

translation suggests that Surrey worked, quite literally, with Douglas at his elbow. The Scots work was the only serious translation of Virgil available to him in a dialect of English: it takes no great effort of the imagination to see Surrey, like his predecessor, consigning Caxton's "buke of Inglys gross" to oblivion. Surrey, we may reasonably assume, set out to do on a smaller scale for his vernacular what Douglas had so magnificently done for Scots - to dignify it by making it the medium of the greatest of Latin poems:

All thocht he stant in Latyn maist perfyte,
 3it stude he nevir weill in our tung endyte. (I, Prol.,
 493-4)

Both poets were no doubt influenced to some extent by continental translations of Virgil - Douglas perhaps by the Eneides de Virgille of Octavien de Saint Gelais (1509),⁹ Surrey by the Italian translations of Francesco de Molza (1539) and Nicolo Liburnio (1534). As humanist translators, both Surrey and Douglas are concerned with accuracy. This consideration no doubt influenced Surrey's choice of blank verse - a derivative of the Italian verso sciolto - as a suitable native equivalent to Virgil's unrhymed hexameters. It is apparent that Surrey strove to capture the conciseness of his Latin original, although there is nothing to indicate any attempt to reproduce the flexible, allusive patterning of the Virgilian verse paragraph. The Eneados illustrates a different kind of approach. In his first Prologue, Douglas discusses the difficulty of reproducing Virgil's meaning, his "sentens", in translation:

Quha is attachit ontill a staik, we se,
 May go na ferthir bot wreil about that tre:
 Rycht so am I to Virgillis text ybund,
 I may nocht fle less than my falt be fund,
 For thocht I wald transcend and go besyde,
 Hys wark remanys, my schame I may nocht hyde.
 And thus I am constrenyt als neir I may
 To hald hys verss and go nane other way,
 Less sum history, subtell word or the ryme
 Causith me mak digressioun sum tyme. (p. 11. 297-306)

Douglas's aim is to translate the Aeneid as closely as he can in order to elucidate its meaning, and he knows his language well enough to recognize that amplification is sometimes necessary to make the sense of the Latin clear:

Sum tyme the text mon haue ane expositioun,
 Sum tyme the collour will causs a litill additioun,
 And sum tyme of a word I mon mak thre...
 Sum tyme I follow the text als neir I may,
 Sum tyme I am constrenyt ane other way..
 For thar be Latyn wordis mony ane
 That in our leyd ganand translatioun hass nane
 Less than we mynyss thar sentens and grauyte
 And zit scant weill exponyt. (pp.12-13. 347-66)

In this first prologue, as elsewhere in the work, the need to strike a balance between literal accuracy and additions which are in the interests of clarity and immediacy is eloquently expressed. Douglas's most recent editor is unfair to suggest that "The theory of translation... is not very subtle": one doubts that either Douglas's theory or his practice as a poet could have been refined by a reading of I.A. Richards.¹⁰

As a translator, Douglas is much more copious than his English successor. Where Surrey follows an ideal of conciseness, Douglas prefers to amplify and to interpret. A second general difference between them is that of metrical form: where Surrey tries to reproduce something like the cadence

of the Latin in his experiment with blank verse, Douglas uses the more conventional form of the rhyming couplet. That Surrey does not follow the Eneados in the matter of rhyme should not be allowed to obscure the fact that the movement of many of his lines, as well as their substance, reflects an appreciation of Douglas's work. Consider, for example, the English poet's use of the first few lines of Douglas's Book II: the Scots,

The Grekis chiftanys, irkit of the weir
Bypast or than samony langsum zeir,
And oft rebutyt by fatale destany
Ane huge horss, lyke ane gret hil, in hy
Craftely thai wrocht... (p.66. 1-5)

becomes in English,

The Grekes chieftains all irked with the war,
Wherin they wasted had so many yeres,
And oft repulst by fatal destinie,
A huge hors made, hye raised like a hill. (18-21)

The rhythm is strikingly similar: in each the first three lines are basically iambic, with the same kind of variation in lines 2 (falling rhythm - "Bypa^xst", wher^xin") and 3 ("de^xstā^xy", "de^xstī^xnie"), and an accumulation of six heavy stresses in line 4. The verbal similarities, which extend to almost three whole lines, are self-evident, and it cannot be argued that these are simply fortuitous: no two wholly independent translators could have arrived at almost the same renditions of "Fracti bello fatisque repulsi/ductores Danaum, tot iam labentibus annis".¹¹ The alliteration of Douglas's fourth line (Virgil's "instar montis equum") evidently appealed to Surrey, although he did not understand that Scots "in hy" meant "in haste" rather than "on high". Ridley draws attention to other examples of the

English translator's imitation of Douglas's word order and rhythms "in an attempt to increase the epic cadence of his verse",¹² but these are not as extensive as the one discussed above. An interesting example of Surrey's borrowing of both diction and rhythm in Book IV is his echo of Douglas's,

O wytles lufe! quhat may be thocht or do,
At thou constrenys nocht mortell myndis tharto?
(p.177, 9-10)

O witlesse loue, what thing is that to do
A mortal minde thou canst not force therto? (540-41)
(Virgil's "improbe Amor, quid non mortalia pectora cogis.")
It would appear that in Surrey's endeavour to reproduce the cadence of Douglas's lines he unwittingly incorporated a couplet into his blank verse.

The most interesting feature of Surrey's purely verbal borrowing from the Eneados is its comprehensiveness. Not only especially striking words, phrases, and lines, but also some of the less distinctive sections of Douglas's translation are echoed. It is easy to understand why Surrey should have been struck by Douglas's rendition of "tot vigiles oculi subter" in the description of Fame - "Als mony walkryfe eyn lurkis thar vndir" (p.165, 17). In the English translation this becomes "As many waker eyes lurk vnderneath", and a few lines later there is a repetition of Douglas's evocative "By nycht scho fleys amyde" (Surrey IV, 237). It is less easy to understand, however, why Surrey should have gone on to follow Douglas's "with mony a taill" and "this rumour" (p.165, 31-2), which are an accurate but

unexceptional rendition of Virgil's sense. (There is no Latin equivalent to "this rumour".) Surrey's translation abounds in such minor borrowings from Douglas,¹³ and coincidence cannot account for all of them. Their significance lies in indicating the degree to which Surrey relied on the older translation.

The vigour of Douglas's Eneados which comes from an imaginative use of Scots - "haymly playn termys famyliar" as well as more elevated speech - leaves an imprint on Surrey's translation. Scots "regrait" (p.69, 27), for example, becomes "regrete" in Surrey's line "With this regrete our hartes from rancor moued" (II, 93), where the word has the sense "expression of regret" rather than the more forceful northern meaning of "renewal of weeping". The same failure to capture the nuances of Scots may be seen in Surrey's use of Douglas's line "Kest vp the portis and yschit furth to play" (p.66, 26). It becomes "The gates cast vp, we issued out to play" (II, 37), and the word is deprived of its Scots sense of "to run forth unrestrained", which is so appropriate in the context of release from the confinement imposed by a long war. In some cases Surrey's use of northern expressions produces an awkward and slightly anachronistic effect, as in the following:

Our first labor thus lucked well with vs (II, 495)
for,

The first lawbour thus lukkit weil with wss (p.85, 43);

Some to the ground were lopen (II, 741)

for,

Sum to the erd loppin (p.93, 12);

From heauen she sent the Goddesse Iris downe
The throwing spirit.... to loose (IV, 926-7),

for,

Hir mayd Irys from the hevyn hess send
The throwand sawle to lowyss..... (p.192, 102).

That Surrey should have attempted to enliven his translation in this way is in itself unexceptionable, but the attempt is not altogether successful because the colloquial flavour of the Scots words is lost in the englishing. Borrowing of this kind is the opposite of what Dunbar does in The Goldyn Targe and what Douglas himself does in the Eneados and The Palice of Honour: i.e., taking over Southern English words of a learned or decorative kind, and combining these with familiar Scots terms. There are fewer dangers inherent in the practice of the Scots poets than in Surrey's use of a vocabulary which is alien to the speech of his immediate audience, although of course Surrey must be given credit for the attempt to make his poetic language more flexible. On occasion he completely misunderstands a word or a phrase in Douglas, and consequently there is a shift and a weakening of meaning. Attention has already been drawn to Surrey's interpretation of "in hy", and some further examples may be noted here. Douglas's account of the departure of the nurse,

Hychit on furth with slaw payss lyke a trat (p.189, 114), becomes in Surrey's translation, "redouble gan../ Her steppes, forth on an aged womans trot" (IV, 857-8): here the English poet seems to have mistaken the Scots "trat" (old woman) for a translation of "gradum". In a similar way, Douglas's line,

Amyd the flambis and armour I in preste (p.82, 76) becomes "Amid the flame and armes ran I in preasse" (II, 431), which clearly does not mean the same thing. Here Douglas is closer to Virgil's "in flammis et in arma feror" (II, 337), and Surrey's reading misses the sense of energetic movement. Misunderstanding of a part of speech alters Douglas's "oft with ryght handis gryp the battalyng wald" (p.88, 14) to the less kinetic, "their righthandis/ Griped for hold thembatel of the wall" (II, 575).

Not all of the northern words taken over by Surrey are inaccurately used, nor do all of them appear awkward in their new setting. There is, for example, nothing incongruous about the adaptation of Douglas's translation of "saevit inops animi totamque incensa per urbem/ bacchatur, qualis commotis excita sacris/ Thyias, ubi audito stimulant trieterica Baccho"... (IV, 300-2):

Scho wyskis wild throu the town of Cartage,
Syk wyss as quhen thir nunnys of Bachus
Ruschis and relis.. (p.171, 40-42)

Then ill bested of counsell rageth she:
And whisketh through the town like Bachus nunne..
(IV, 388-9)

Here the onomatopoeic "wyskis" and the description of the Bacchae transfer easily into English. Douglas makes full use of the opportunities offered by Virgil's similes for vividly localized descriptive effects, and it is hardly surprising to find Surrey borrowing from the Scots for another epic simile earlier in Book IV. His description of the Trojans rebuilding the fleet,

Like ants, when they do spoile the bing of corne,
(IV, 529)

is derived from Douglas's,

lyke emmotis grete

Quhen thai depulze the mekill byng of quhete. (p.176,
79-80)

Scots "bing" is effective in the English translation because of its agrarian associations, although the vigour of Douglas's line is weakened by the introduction of the auxiliary verb.

The extent of Surrey's use of the Scots translation is suggested by his repetition of a substantial number of those felicitous "litill additiouns" which permeate Douglas's Virgil. Attention has been drawn above to the "Bacchus' nun" passage, and some further examples of this kind of borrowing may be observed. One of the most effective is Douglas's allusion to the dead Priam ("sine nomine corpus") - "A corps but lyfe, renown or other fame" (p.93, 87), which becomes in Surrey's translation "A body now without renome, and fame" (II, 730). The English poet follows his predecessor's free rendition of "auratasque trabes, veterum decora illa parentum/ devolvunt" (II, 448-9),

The gilt sperris and gestis gold begane
Down on thame slyng thai, and mony costly stane,
The prowde and ryal werkis of faderis ald. (p.88, 19-21)

(Compare Surrey, II, 580-81.) Other such expansions include Douglas's description of the horse - "suttell hors of tre" (p.77, 73; cf. Surrey II, 303), the detail "Standing wod wraith" in the account of Juno's rage (p.96, 96; cf. Surrey II, 806), and the epithet "the grysly" in the reference to Erebus (p.182, 76; cf. Surrey IV, 684). Surrey does not, of course, amplify and extend to the extent that Douglas

does, but the fact that he follows any of the departures from the letter of Virgil at all suggests a recognition that Douglas could localize the Latin effectively without destroying its meaning. It is interesting that Surrey makes no "litill additiouns" of his own, being content to choose from Douglas's amplifications of Virgil.

Since there has been a large amount of quotation in the preceding paragraphs, it may be useful to provide a brief summary of what has been said so far about Surrey's borrowing from Douglas. Its comprehensiveness is probably the most important feature: in either of Surrey's books it is difficult to find ten lines in which there is not some echo of the Eneados. Frequently there are echoes of sound and cadence as well as purely verbal parallels: the arrangement of words into metrical patterns influenced Surrey's style, despite the strictures imposed by the blank verse form. The verbal borrowings are of two main kinds, minor and major. In a sense the minor borrowings - the repetition of comparatively undistinguished words and phrases in Douglas's translation - are of just as much interest as Surrey's echoes of particularly striking passages in the Scots, since they reflect the extent of the English translator's familiarity with the Eneados. Since Surrey lacked Douglas's knowledge of Scots as a spoken language it is inevitable that there should be a degree of misunderstanding, but nevertheless a substantial number of northern words make the transition into "sudron" with a minimum of strain. For example, Douglas's sonorous line "Wyth this the

hevyn sa quhyrlit about his speir" (p.78, 1; Virgil's "Vertitur interea caelum") loses nothing by becoming "With this the skie gan whirle about the sphere" (II, 316). The languages have sufficient in common to permit such word by word transference.

The conclusion reached by Otto Fest in an early study of Surrey's indebtedness to Douglas¹⁴ is confirmed by Florence Ridley: Surrey "draws upon Douglas to increase the precision, vigor, and ornament of his own work....again and again Surrey takes from Douglas precisely those words that help make an action live."¹⁵ An appreciation of Douglas's ability to make Virgil familiar to his audience through amplifying the Latin is presumably what prompted Surrey's repetitions of some of Douglas's "litill additions". It is more important, however, to recognize that Surrey makes no large-scale attempt to imitate that "fowth of langage" which makes Douglas's work so rich and vigorous. The English poet did not, admittedly, have the support of a poetic language which was as wide-ranging as the Scots, a tradition in which the formal and the "literary" were frequently combined with the everyday and the colloquial. Despite this deprivation, however, there is a strong element of selectivity which governs what Surrey does and does not take from Douglas. The English poet quite clearly chose not to attempt the kind of "precision, vigor, and ornament" which makes his predecessor's work so distinctive. Comparison of the ways in which the two poets render the Latin similes brings out the differences. Here are the two

translations of Virgil's figurative account of the destruction wrought by Pyrrhus and his band:

Not sa fersly the fomy ryver or flude
Brekis our the bankis on spait quhen it is wode,
 And, with hys brusch and fard of watir brown,
 The dykis and the schoris bettis doun,
 Ourspredand croftis and flattis with his spait,
 Our al the feildis that thai may row a bayt,
 Quhil howsys and the flokkis flyttis away,
 The corn grangis and standand stakkis of hay. (p.90,
 101-8)

Not so fercely doth ouerflow the feldes
The foming flood, that brekes out of his bankes:
 Whoes rage of waters beares away what heapes
 Stand in his way, the coates, and eke the herdes.
 (II, 640-3)

The brevity of Surrey's passage marks the difference of approach: clearly the model here is the conciseness of the Latin,

non sic, aggeribus ruptis cum spumeus amnis
 exiit oppositasque evicit gurgite moles,
 fertur in arva furens cumulo camposque per omnis
 cum stabulis armenta trahit. (II, 496-9)

It is not difficult for Surrey to follow Virgil in the matter of length, but he fails to capture the allusiveness of the Latin - a matter of both sense and rhythm. Virgil's simile is an uninterrupted sweep of words. The alliteration at the end of Surrey's second line intensifies the pause after "bankes", and this break in the flow of the simile detracts from its force: there is a further loss in vigour in the removal of the verbs from their positions at the beginning of the lines ("exiit", "fertur"). There is nothing in the English to correspond to Virgil's "gurgitur", with its connotations of excess and indulgence, so appropriate in the context of Pyrrhus's fury. Surrey's lines are not bad verse, but their extensive alliteration is no sub-

stitute for the force of Virgil's rhythm and compression. The underlined words in the quotation indicate that the alliteration, as well as some of the vocabulary, is taken over from Douglas. But no further did Surrey go in his borrowing, preferring a clipped brevity to the Scots poet's detailed and imaginative expansion of the original. Douglas conjures up for his audience the picture of a real river "in spait", using a series of familiar words - "dykis", "schoris", "croftis", "flattis", "feildis", "howsys", "flokakis", "grangis", "stakkis" - to evoke the scale of the destruction. Although the passage is longer and more particular than the Latin, Douglas successfully recreates Virgil's onomatopoeic sweeping effect: from the first line to the last there is no interruption to the onward thrust of the words, a remarkable achievement, considering that Douglas writes in what is basically a two-line sense unit. Moreover, he is sensitive to Virgil's choice of words: the list of objects swept away, and the use of "wode" to describe the torrent, successfully recreate the sense of "gurgitur". As in the Latin, additional emphasis is gained by the placing of the verb at the beginning of the line (102, 105). Here, as in the other similes, Douglas's expansion results in an increase of particularity which is nevertheless faithful to Virgil's "sentens". In comparison, Surrey's attempts to maintain a classical economy in his translation are cautious and pallid, and as renditions of Virgil's meaning they are less accurate than Douglas's reworkings.¹⁶

Like the avoidance of Douglas's more extensive departures from the letter of his original, the choice of blank verse instead of rhymed couplet may be assumed to reflect Surrey's desire to surpass his Scots predecessor as an authentic translator of Virgil. Ridley, while acknowledging that Surrey's prosody is far from equalling that of the original, suggests that the movement of his verse is closer to the Latin than the movement of Douglas's verse is:

The prosody of Douglas is less Vergilian than that of Surrey. Douglas' clipped heroic couplets almost demand that ideas be expressed in units of two lines; and though he does employ enjambment, most of his lines tend to be end-stopped, even if by a barely perceptible pause. Obviously, then, his form was not designed to reproduce most successfully the sinuous sweep of Vergilian statement. Surrey has freedom from the two-line unit of expression, and from the necessity of concluding each pair of lines with words that at once translate accurately and rhyme.¹⁷

There is the further suggestion that Douglas usually translates Virgil's "sentens" at the expense of "eloquens", because of his use of the couplet.¹⁸ These claims are illustrated by quotation and comparison, but nevertheless they must be viewed with some scepticism. In the handling of the epic simile discussed above, Douglas's translation is more supple, more "Vergilian", whereas Surrey's is the one which tends to be clipped. Ridley exaggerates the extent to which the Scots poet's couplets produce an end-stopped effect, and although the scope of this study does not permit an exhaustive examination of Douglas's prosody, it should be stressed that an intelligent use is made of enjambment and various kinds of metrical variation to enhance the flow of the lines.

It is necessary to examine quite extensive passages from the two translations to see how Douglas's couplets are in fact more eloquent than Surrey's blank verse. I have chosen to compare the two versions of Aeneas's account of the return of the dead Hector to announce the imminent destruction of Troy (Aeneid II, 274-97). This comparison will also help to clarify the nature of Surrey's borrowing from Douglas, and thus to reinforce what I have attempted to show in the paragraphs above.

Ha, walloway, quhat harm and wo eneuch!	44
Quhat ane was he, how far changit from ioy	
Of that Hector, quhilum returnyt to Troy	
Cled with the spulze of hym Achillys,	
Or quhen the Troiane fyry blesis, I wyss,	
On Grekis schippis thyk fald he slang that day	
Quhen that he slew the duke Prothesylay!	50
Hys fax and berd was fadyt quhar he stude	
And all hys hayr was glotnyt ful of blude.	
Full mony woundis on his body bayr he,	
Quhilk in defens of hys natyve cuntre	
About the wallys of Troy ressavyt he had.	55
Me thocht I first wepyng and na thing glaid	
Rycht reuerently begouth to clepe this man,	
And with sik dolorus wordis thus began:	
"O thou, of Troy the lemand lamp of lycht,	
O Troiane hope, maist ferm defens in fyght,	60
Quhat has the tareit? Quhy maid thou this delay,	
Hector, quham we desyrit mony a day?	
From quhat cuntre this wyss cummyn art thou?	
That eftir feil slauchter of thi frendis now	
And of thi folkis and cite efter huge payn,	65
Quhen we beyn irkit, we se the heir agayn!	
Quhat hard myschance fylyt so thi plesand face?	
Or quhy se I tha feil woundis, allace?"	
Onto thir wordis he nane answer maid,	
Nor to my voyd demandis na thyng said,	70
Bot with ane hevy murmour, as it were draw	
Furth of the boddum of his breste weil law,	
"Allace, allace, thou goddes son," quod he,	
"Salf thi self from this fyre and fast thou fle.	
Our ennemyss has thir worthy wallys tane;	75
Troy from the top down fallys, and all is gane.	
Enewch has lestit of Priamus the ryng,	
The fatis wil na mair it induryng.	
Gif Pergama, the Troiane wallys wyght,	
Mycht langar haue beyn fendit into fyght,	80
With this rycht hand thai suld haue be defendit.	
Adew, fair weil, for euer it is endit.	

In thi keping committis Troy but less
 Hir kyndly goddis clepit Penates;
 Tak thir in falloschip of thi fatis all, 85
 And large wallis for thame seik thou sall,
 Quhilk at the last thi self sall beld vp hie
 Eftir lang wandryng and errour our the see."
 Thus said Hectour, and schew furth in his handis
 The dreidfull valis, wymplis and garlandis 90
 Of Vesta, goddes of the erth and fyre,
 Quhilk in hir tempil eternaly byrnys schyre. (pp.79-80)

This corresponds to Surrey's,

Ay me, what one? that Hector how vnlike,
Which erst returnd clad with Achilles spoiles: 350
 Or when he threw into the Grekish shippes
 The Troiane flame? So was his beard defiled,
 His crisped lockes al clustred with his blood:
 With all such wounds, as many he receiued
About the walls of that his natie town. 355
 Whome franckly thus, me thought, I spake vnto,
 With bitter teres and dolefull deadly voice,
 O Troyan light, O only hope of thine:
 What lettes so long thee staid? or from what costes.
 Our most desired Hector, doest thou come? 360
 Whom after slaughter of thy many frends,
 And trauail of the people, and thy town,
 Alweried (lord) how gladly we behold.
 What sory chaunce hath staind thy liuely face?
Or why see I these woundes (alas) so wide? 365
 He answeard nought, nor in my vain demaundes
 Abode, but from the bottom of his brest
 Sighing he sayd: flee, flee, O Goddesse son,
 And saue thee from the furie of this flame.
 Our enmies now ar maisters of the walles: 370
 And Troye town now falleth from the top.
Sufficeth that is done for Priams reigne.
 If force might serue to succor Troye town,
 This right hand well mought haue ben her defense.
 But Troye now commendeth to thy charge 375
 Her holy reliques, and her priuy Gods.
 Them ioyne to thee, as felowes of thy fate.
Large walles rere thow for them. For so thou shalt,
After time spent in thouerwandred flood.
 This sayd, he brought fourth Vesta in his hands, 380
 Her fillettes eke, and euerlasting flame.

(The underlining, taken from Ridley's edition, indicates
 apparent borrowings from Douglas.)

Surrey's concern for conciseness imposes a limitation
 on the achievement of a sense of spoken eloquence, which is

obviously important in passages of direct speech. His lines are for the most part elegant and graceful, but there is little of that effect which is produced by Douglas's balancing of the demands of prosody against a feeling for the rhythms and the idiom of speech. "Ay me, what one?" is perfectly acceptable as a literary exclamation, the equivalent of Virgil's "ei mihi, qualis erat", but it is far removed from Douglas's forcefully colloquial, "Ha, walloway, quhat harm and wo eneuch!" The editorial question mark in Surrey's line 352 is unnecessary and perhaps also misleading, but even when it is removed the "when he" in line 351 appears to have little justification other than to satisfy the metrical demands of the line. The "quhen" of Douglas's line 48, on the other hand, introduces a clause which parallels the adverbial construction of the preceding lines. The meaning of Surrey's first four lines is perfectly clear (despite their slightly awkward word order), but in the attempt to maintain the brevitas and the word order of the Latin "quantam mutatus ab illo/ Hectore, qui redit exuvias indutus Achilli/ vel Danaum Phrygios iaculatus puppibus ignis" (274-6), Surrey fails to reproduce the flow of the utterance which in the Latin contributes to an effect both elegaic and strongly dramatic. Douglas's rendition of the passage is more copious, but it does catch the movement and the feeling of the original. "Thyk fald" (49) is a characteristic "particularization" of Virgil, but it effectively complements the sense. Later, Douglas again catches the mood of the Latin when he comes to translate Aeneas's agitated questioning of his visitor. In the Scots, as in

the Latin, the speaker's agitated and slightly reproachful frame of mind is conveyed by a series of short questions. In place of Douglas's simple and direct,

Quhat has the tareit? Quhy maid thou this delay,
Hector, quham we desyrit mony a day?
From quhat cuntre this wyss cummyn art thou?

Surrey offers the stilted,

What lettes so long thee staid? or from what costes.
Our most desired Hector, doest thou come?

In the interests of condensation, the English line creates an imbalance of stress and hence of meaning: the accumulation of heavily accented syllables - "doest thou come" - detracts from the force which should accrue to the first half of the line. Douglas, by contrast, effectively conveys the poignancy of Virgil's "quibus Hector ab oris/ expectate venis?"

Credit must be given to Surrey for his experiment with blank verse, and perhaps it is only to be expected that he should handle a medium new to English less competently than his predecessor handles the couplet. In the English translation, Hector's speech is free of the pseudo-classical syntax which mars the earlier part of the passage, but the imitation of Virgil's short sense units produces a staccato effect which misses most of Virgil's sense of drama (see especially 377-9). Douglas's translation is much more fluid, with variation from the two line unit of meaning. The rhymes are not allowed to intrude: the sense of the couplet is frequently completed in the following line (79-81, 85-7, 89-91), and there are departures from the basic

iambic pattern which mean that stress does not always fall upon the last syllable of the line. In the passage quoted, as throughout the Eneados, the poet's feeling for the rhythms of speech helps to save the rhyming from monotony. The sense of authorial presence which is so strong in Douglas's work is absent from most of Surrey's translation: even when his verse is not impeded by an awkward word order, it is seldom so easily accommodated to the capabilities of the speaking voice.

The English translation indicates a number of verbal borrowings from the Scots. Both their incidence and their general nature typify Surrey's practice throughout the translation. Close examination of the more extended of them shows that what is taken over into the English translation is seldom accompanied by the poetic implications of the Scots original. Surrey's "Which erst returnd clad with Achilles spoiles", for example, misses the suggestive "quhilum returnyt to Troy". The stress placed on "quhilum" by the medial pause after "Hector" effectively reproduces the sense of Virgil's "mutatus", juxtaposing the victorious past against the inglorious present. A little later, "About the walls of that his natiue town" seems to echo Douglas's "of his natyve cuntre/ About the wallys of Troy", an amplification which Douglas makes to obtain the sense of Virgil's allusive "patriam". The more concise English line carries no comparable emotive association. Although he is a master in the art of amplification, Douglas has the ability to use language concisely, to make a single word convey more than

one meaning. This is apparent in the line "Or quhy se I tha feil woundis, allace?" where "feil" has the double sense of "many" and "mortal". Since there is no Virgilian counterpart to either sense, it is obvious that Surrey is following Douglas when he writes "Or why see I these woundes (alas) so wide?" "So wide", clearly enough, is not a very sensitive rendering of the Scots. It is easy to see why the English poet appropriates Douglas's alliterating translation of "imo de pectore ducens", but here too what is borrowed is only a part of the sense:

Bot with ane hevy murmour, as it war draw
Furth of the boddum of his breste weil law,

catches the sense of Virgil's "graviter" more accurately than "from the bottom of his brest/ Sighing he sayd".

The danger that in the English translation conciseness may be opposed to accuracy and sense is further illustrated by Surrey's rendition of "sed patriae Priamoque datum" - "Sufficeth that is done for Priams reigne". "Reigne" is borrowed from Douglas's more copious and more sensitive translation, with its starkly monosyllabic "all is gane". At the end of the speech, Douglas recreates the portentousness of the Latin through an imaginatively expanded translation in which careful attention is given to stress and movement. "Eftir lang wandryng and errour our the see", prominent because it is the culmination of a four-line utterance, is given further emphasis by the accumulation of heavy stresses and the decisive pause before "Thus said Hectour". Surrey's line, "After time spent in thouerwandred

flood" is closer to Virgil from a purely literal standpoint, but it lacks the eloquence of "magna pererrato statues quae denique ponto", which Douglas so skilfully recreates. It is Douglas rather than Surrey who manages to convey the pagan awe in the face of the emblems of divinity. Surrey's lines 380-81 have a certain climactic elegance, but they contain none of the mystery of Douglas's slow-paced, sonorous translation of "et manibus vittas Vestamque potentum/aeternumque adytis effert penetralibus ignem". Recognition of Douglas's achievement in creating such equivalents to the allusive understatement of Virgil's style should make the modern reader question the validity of Coldwell's suggestion that expansions of the Latin "make the poem more lively, probably, than it was originally, but at the sacrifice of some of the melancholy and elegaic tone."¹⁹

Surrey's rendering of Virgil into English is a two-fold process of translation: he endeavours to translate the Latin with the maximum possible conciseness, and at the same time to support and enliven his "englishing" by translation from Douglas's Scots version. The borrowings from the Eneados frequently assist to give vigour and precision to Surrey's work, and the incidence of them suggests that Surrey obtained a very considerable amount of support from the Scots translation. The English work is a different kind of translation - in that it attempts to reproduce the conciseness and aspects of the verbal texture of the Latin - and however much Surrey may have appreciated the verbal richness and the variety of the Scots version, his own

scheme of translation inevitably ruled out any attempt to imitate Douglas's inventive amplification of Virgil's poem. Because of its lively complexity, Douglas's translation has more in common with the Aeneid than has the more concise English translation which C.S. Lewis describes, not unfairly, as "Virgil in corsets".²⁰ Surrey's work does sometimes achieve grace and elegance, but it shows a neglect for the lesson which Douglas's translation offers to other writers - that it is impossible, given the resources of "Inglis" language and metre, to provide an accurate and subtle rendering of the great Latin poem on the basis of a "word by word" translation.

No serious attempt has ever been made to question Barnabie Googe's view that Douglas's Eneados is superior to all other English translations of the period, Surrey's included:

The Noble H. Haward once,
That raught eternall fame,
With mighty style did bring a pece
Of Virgil's worke in frame,
And Grimaold gave the lyke attempt,
And Douglas wan the Ball,
Whose famous wyt in Scottysh ryme
Has made an ende of all.²¹

Surrey's translation is an exercise rather than, like Douglas's, an independent poem. The distinction is partly one of literary merit, partly one of scale - Surrey's two books pale into insignificance beside Douglas's translation of thirteen, each of which is introduced by a wholly original prologue, serving to underline the significance of Virgil's matter for a Christian audience, and to dramatize the poet's involvement in his task. The unsatisfactory prospect of an

incomplete translation prompts the reflection, "Na thing is done quhil ocht remanys ado" (p.65, 152). It is reasonable to infer that Surrey's motivation as a translator was of an altogether different kind - a desire to show that Virgil could be translated into English rather than to make his "haill sentens" available to a wide audience. Douglas's Eneados is both an imaginative translation and a demonstration of the vigour and the variety of the Scots poetic tradition. Throughout Douglas's work, and most overtly in a virtuoso piece like "the perle of May", he writes with the support of earlier poetry in which there is a place for all kinds of language, from "harsk" colloquialism to brilliant formal elegance, and in which dramatic unity is provided by the emphasis on spoken effects. This kind of tradition was simply not available to Surrey, at least in his own language: the "new company of courtly makers" in the reign of Henry VIII to which Puttenham alludes²² had learned to make use of spoken rhythms in poetry, but what was appropriate for poetic language was governed by a decorum which was much more narrow than that followed by the Scots poets. Puttenham observes that northern language is the "purer English Saxon, yet it is not so Courtly nor so currant [smooth-flowing] as our Southerne English is".²³ The Elizabethan critic's standard of taste is partly moulded by the practice of Wyatt and Surrey, whose poetic language conforms to the ideal of speech for men "ciuill and graciously behauoured and bred". Although its borrowing from the Scots helps to provide life and variety, Surrey's Aeneid translation shows all too clearly that Virgil could not be translated

adequately into a poetic idiom which set such a high value upon the "courtly" and "currant".

Whether Surrey knew that Wyatt before him had augmented an exercise in a classical genre by borrowing from a Scots poem cannot of course be proved. The fact remains, however, that the two most notable members of Puttenham's "new company of courtly makers", the younger heavily influenced by the older, knew at least some northern verse, and saw fit to use it to enrich the texture of their own exercises in classicism. Wyatt's adaptation of The Two Mice for his Horatian verse epistle, "My mothers maydes when they did sowe and spynne",²⁴ is not of course on the same scale as Surrey's use of the Eneados, but it is nevertheless significant. Although H.A. Mason will not allow of any indebtedness to Henryson,²⁵ there are several signs that it exists. Wyatt's development of the fable, and its consequent thematic emphasis, are admittedly different from Henryson's. Wyatt's country mouse, tired of the deprivations imposed by her rural life, falls to envying her urban sister, pays her a visit, and discovers her living in nervous comfort. The cat interrupts their lavish reunion banquet, the country mouse trips in her effort to escape, and disaster ensues. In the Scots fable, the burgess mouse visits her sister in the country, and is appalled by the crudity of her fare: both travel to the town, and in the course of their feasting they are interrupted by the steward, who fails to see them. The country mouse's terror is overcome by her urbane sister's blandishments, but almost

immediately comes the cat: the visitor has a narrow escape, and returns thankfully to the country. Henryson's "moralitie" is that self-seeking brings with it increased "trubill and vexatioun", and that for this reason the simple, honest way of life is to be preferred. The narrative in Wyatt's poem is more concise, in that there is only one visit, and the portrayal of the mice is different from Henryson's. The country mouse in Wyatt's poem is bitter, envious of her sister, while the town mouse lives in fear: in the Scots fable the one is very well aware of the virtues of the simple life, while the other faces perilous prosperity with equanimity. Wyatt's development of the fable complements his distinctively gloomy moralitas that men are never content with what they have, never prepared to recognize that "Eche kynd of lyff hath with hym his disease" (80), but that nevertheless the "quyete liff" offers some hope for virtuous living. This treatment is also far removed from Horace's (Satires II, vi, 77-117). The Latin fable combines two visits, in the same order as in the Scots version, and its implied lesson, that "peace of mind (even when accompanied by hard work and austerity) is not to be exchanged for anxiety (even in the midst of leisure and luxury)"²⁶ is closer to Henryson's emphasis than to Wyatt's.

Although Wyatt's fable differs from Henryson's, there are several echoes of the Scots fable. First, Wyatt's emphasis on the rigours of the simple life in winter (5-17) recalls Henryson's detail of the "hunger, cauld.. and grit distress" endured by the upland mouse (170). Second, there

is the sex and the relationship of the characters: in Wyatt, as in Henryson, they are sisters. (In Horace and in Caxton's Aesop, on the other hand, the mice are male, and friends rather than brothers.) Third, the town feast in both poems is disturbed by the cat. Fourth, both Scots and English mice cry "peip" to attract attention (The Two Mice, 187, 308: Satire, 42). In Henryson's poem, "they drank the watter cleir/ In steid off wyne", and in Wyatt's, "they drancke the wyne so clere": significantly, both rhyme "clear" with "cheer" (The Two Mice, 272-3: Satire, 47, 49). Although there are differences of emphasis between the two moralitates, it should be noted that like Henryson, Wyatt observes that all states are subject to change (The Two Mice, 368-70: Satire, 80), and that both poets admonish mankind sternly:

O wanton man! that usis for to feid
Thy wambe.. (The Two Mice, 381f.)

O wretched myndes, there is no gold that may
Graunt that ye seke! (Satire, 75-6)

Considered together, these parallels represent conclusive evidence that Wyatt knew and used Henryson's fable.²⁷

Commenting on Wyatt's lyric poetry, Mason argues with some justification, "that every word and phrase used by Wyatt was a commonplace and had been used by many of his predecessors",²⁸ and for this reason it is dangerous to suggest particular sources for lines and images in the lyrics. Nevertheless, I would like to suggest that on one occasion at least Wyatt drew upon the work of Dunbar. The sonnet which begins "You that in love finde lucke and

habundance",²⁹ contains an address to those lovers who, unlike the poet, enjoy "felicities":

Arrise for shame! Do away your sluggardie!
 Arise, I say, do May some obseruance!
 Let me in bed lye dreeming in mischaunce. (3-5)

These lines recall parts of May's address to the poet in The Thrissil and the Rois: e.g.,

"Slugird," scho said, "awalk annone for schame.. (22)

"Uprys, and do thy observance.. (37)

Dunbar's lines are nearer to Wyatt's than are the Chaucerian parallels listed by Thomson.³⁰ There is the further coincidence that Wyatt, like Dunbar, assumes a truculent pose: both poets are more inclined to remain in bed than to embark upon a celebration of love. Indebtedness to Dunbar cannot be proved, but there could be nothing extraordinary in Wyatt's knowledge of The Thrissil and the Rois, in view of the association of the Rose's daughter with his own courtly circle.

Wyatt's indebtedness to Scots poetry is, of course, less considerable than the indebtedness of sixteenth century Scots poetry to Wyatt. Although detailed consideration of the extent to which Scots poets were influenced by Wyatt's lyric poetry is beyond the scope of this thesis, something should be said about the nature of the relationship between the Scots love lyric and Wyatt's verse. Patricia Thomson observes that the relationship of Wyatt to Chaucer (and by implication, of Wyatt to earlier English poetry in the Chaucerian lyrical style) "is best stated in terms of affinity and guidance. Their relationship may, indeed, fall

outside the legitimate sphere of literary debts and influences".³¹ Broadly speaking, Wyatt's practice is to rework the conventions of the English love lyric (e.g., of language, imagery, and the attitudes of the courtly lover), creating new and often startling combinations of the conventional techniques, within a great variety of short lyric forms. Most of his love poems, including the imitations of Petrarch, rely for their effect on statements, direct and in simple language. Using this plain style - a "courtly" and "currant" form of spoken eloquence - Wyatt draws attention to the ironies and ambiguities of his state of mind. The variations within the overall mode of statement are seldom extreme, in the sense that there is rarely movement from the high rhetorical style to blunt colloquialism. Variation is rather from one mood of "mannerly" speech to another: for example (as in "Helpe me to seke"),³² from gentle request to the lady to introspective questioning, and thence to more urgent request. Many of the poems in Bannatyne's "ballattis of luve" use similar techniques to those of Wyatt: Scott's poetry, for example, often illustrates a concern for simplicity and directness, with variations of mood being accomplished without significant variation in the level of vocabulary used. In the poetry of Scott, as in some of the other Bannatyne lyrics, it is possible to point to techniques which appear to have been borrowed from Wyatt - for example, the short clipped statement, the alternation of short lines with long, and the short refrain which throws into sharp relief what has gone before. In the best of the Scots lyrics (e.g., Scott's "It

cumis you luvaris to be laill"³³ and "The answeir to the ballat of hairtis"³⁴), there is a sense of wit, an observation by the intellect of the emotional state, which recalls the manner of Wyatt's "To wisshe and want and not obtain",³⁵ and "My pen, take payn a lytyll space".³⁶

R.D.S. Jack is right to emphasize the importance of Wyatt as a model for poets such as Scott and Montgomerie,³⁷ and it is highly probable that Wyatt's Petrarchanism was a guide for the Castalian sonneteers. Yet although important, the relationship of the Scots lyricists to Wyatt is similar to Wyatt's relationship to Chaucer, in being one of "affinity and guidance". There is little slavish imitation of Wyatt, just as in earlier Scots poetry there is little slavish imitation of Chaucer. Wyatt's simplicity and elegance, his control and his experimentation with a variety of lyric forms, may have set a standard for Scott and others, but it should be remembered that like Wyatt and his circle in England, the Scots were reinterpreting a variety of lyric conventions, Scottish and Chaucerian alike. The differences between Wyatt and Scott are just as important as the similarities: Scott's attitude to love is more appetitive (and perhaps more cynical) than Wyatt's, and at the level of style there is a greater exploitation of the higher and lower levels of style, as well as a more thorough use of alliteration. Wyatt may have known Dunbar, but Scott clearly knew him much better. Scott's authorship of "Lo, quhat it is to lufe" cannot be demonstrated conclusively, but there is nothing to disprove MacQueen's theory that

Scott wrote the poem, "and either.. Wyatt made a personal reply or.. he utilized a song by Scott as the basis for a more extended poem of his own".³⁸ It would have been wholly appropriate for Wyatt to "extend" a Scots poem of this kind, because he would have recognized its inventive use of lyric conventions as the product of a creative sensibility similar to his own.

Chapter IX

Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis and
Skelton's Magnyfycence.

Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis, Sir David Lindsay's panoramic appeal for reformation of church and state, is the earliest surviving example of a complete Scottish play. It is important, as Dr. A.J. Mill suggests in her pioneering study of medieval Scottish drama, that the critic should resist the temptation to see Lindsay's great play in a position of splendid isolation.¹ Ane Satyre, like so much late medieval Scottish poetry, illustrates the operation of an individual writer's creative powers upon an inherited literary tradition. It is impossible to study it in the context of a national dramatic tradition, for the simple reason that none of the dramatic entertainments alluded to in the public records of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have survived.² There is no such obstacle, however, to comparing Ane Satyre with plays written outside Scotland, and there are several studies which discuss Lindsay's debt to fifteenth and early sixteenth century French drama.³ It would be wrong to deny the possibility that a play such as Pierre Gringore's Jeu du Prince des Sotz influenced the form and spirit of Lindsay's work, but it is equally important to recognize that Ane Satyre has roots in the tradition of the fifteenth century English morality play, the tradition to which plays such as Pride of Life, The Castle of Perseverance, and Mankind belong. The English affinities of Lindsay's play have received scant critical attention: Dr. Mill, for example, confines herself to the observation that "both in its setting and in its clear development of the Vice role Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis is in the tradition of the

English moralities".⁴ In this chapter I shall attempt to show that the play is an outgrowth of the English drama by virtue of its close connection with Skelton's innovatory political morality, Magnyfycence. The resemblances between the English play and the first part of Ane Satyre are sufficiently close to suggest that Lindsay was influenced by Skelton's work, which had been published, perhaps by John Rastell, several years before 1540, the date of the first recorded production of a form of Lindsay's play.⁵ It is possible that Lindsay first made the acquaintance of the late laureate's "goodly Interlude and a mery" during the course of his official duties in 1535, when he was one of the party sent to receive the Order of the Garter on behalf of James V.⁶ Skelton's play had been printed by 1532, probably by Rastell's press.⁷

In order to appreciate fully the resemblances between the two plays, it is necessary to be aware of Skelton's contribution to the development of the dramatic genre to which the "first pairt" of the Scottish play belongs. Earlier English morality plays took as their theme the potentialities of man's free will, developing this theme in terms of a conflict between the forces of good and evil for the soul of a generalized protagonist Humanum Genus. Typically, Mankind is tempted by the forces of Pride and Sensuality, succumbs, and at a later stage in his life recognizes his folly when confronted by Death or Adversity: regeneration follows recognition, and he is saved by divine mercy. The earliest English morality fragment Pride of Life⁸

(ca. 1400),⁹ tells how Rex Vivus rejects Wisdom and Religion for the joys of Strength, Health, and Mirth, is eventually beaten down in "a sterne strife" with Death, but is saved from damnation through the intercession of the Virgin. In The Castle of Perseverance (ca. 1425),¹⁰ the hero Mankind is successfully seduced from the company of his Good Angel by the formidable approaches of the legions of the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. The young Mankind is knit in "sowre swettenesse" with the Seven Deadly Sins, but in the middle of life comes to Confession and resolves to embrace the virtue of Perseverance. After a vigorous battle between vices and virtues, the ageing Mankind decides to follow Covetousness. Predictably, he is confronted by the implacable Death, but after he dies his soul is saved by the intercession of Mercy and Peace with Truth and Righteousness. The moral announced in the last lines of the play,

All men example here-at may take,
to mayntein þe goode, & mendyn here mys:

.....
To saue þou fro synnyng,
Evyr at þe begynnyng
Thynke on þoure last endyng!

applies equally to the later moralities Mankind (ca. 1470),¹¹ and Henry Medwall's Nature (ca. 1495).¹² In the former, Mankind puts himself under the tutelege of Mercy, and embarks on a temperate and godly life as a tiller of the soil. He is able to resist the blandishments of the World (presented by a trio of roisterers named New-Guise, Nowadays, and Naught), but succumbs with startling ease to Titivillus, the Devil. Mankind is compelled to patch up his differences

with the worldly trio, who lose no time in introducing him to "that styntyng dungehyll", the Flesh. Eventually he is deserted, but reclaimed by Mercy. In Medwall's play, Mankind forsakes his first guides Reason and Innocency for the company of Worldly Affection, Pride, Sensuality, and the other vices who make pretence to disguise their true identities. Man's conscience leads him to Shamefastness, and he resolves to be guided again by Reason. Repentance, however, is short-lived, and in the second part of the play Man comes again under the sway of the deadly sins. In old age he turns to Reason, Charity, and Patience, and is brought "From the vale of syn whyche ys full of derknes/ toward the contemplacyon of lyght that ys endles" (1385-6).

Another late morality play, Mundus et Infans,¹³ printed in 1522, traces a similar pattern of worldly prosperity, apparent spiritual regeneration, fall and relapse, followed by final regeneration and salvation. In this piece there is a strong emphasis on the allegorical topics of the pèlerinage de la vie humaine and the Three Ages of Man, which are implicit in the earlier morality plays. The name of the central character changes continually throughout the play: as a child, the baby Infans is given the name Wanton, which changes in his adolescence to Lust-and-Liking, and after "one and twenty wynter" to Manhood, who proclaims himself king of the vices (275-81). In middle age Manhood is enlightened through the power of Conscience, but he comes again under the sway of Folly, who represents the seven deadly sins in a new guise (458-61). Manhood has his

name changed to Shame, and soon after to Age, but Perseverance intervenes and he is renamed Repentance.

The above outline of fifteenth and early sixteenth century English morality plays should be sufficient to indicate a strong continuity in theme and in development of a "mankind" protagonist, even though it does little to illuminate dramatic qualities such as the liveliness of "vice" characters and the awesome demeanour of Adversity and Age.¹⁴ E.K. Chambers observes that the moralities differ from the earlier miracle plays in that they "aim rather at ethical cultivation than the stablishing of faith".¹⁵ Man must struggle to direct his will towards a Christian ideal of living, to recognize that devotion to worldly pleasure in its various forms can lead only to betrayal and ultimate damnation, but for the intervention of Grace. In Magnyfycence, Skelton makes a radical departure from the traditional emphasis of the fifteenth century morality play. His concern is not to illustrate an ideal of right conduct for mankind, but rather to amplify a particular kind of right conduct, that proper to a prince. Edwards oversimplifies when he states that "where his models set their hero against a background of eternity, Skelton keeps strictly to this world",¹⁶ since the play's conclusion makes it clear that the rod of heaven will descend to punish the mistreadings of even the mightiest of secular governors. Magnyfycence is overtaken by the conventional morality figure of Adversity, who proclaims himself as "The Stroke of God" (1882), and like the mankind

heroes of the earlier plays, the prince is saved by Grace rather than by his own merits. Yet although the divine perspective is integral to the meaning of the play, its ethical concerns are far removed from those of the traditional morality. This is forcibly illustrated by the conclusion, which presents beside the conventional warnings about mutability (2505-32) the image of a regenerated prince returning "Home to [his] paleys with Ioy and Ryalte" (2562), in the company of his wise counsellors.

The opening debate between Felycyte and Lyberte, its reconciliation by Measure, and the ordering by Magnyfycence of his trio of servants, serve to define the play's central character and to introduce its allegorical action. Magnyfycence represents an ideal governor, whose conduct is guided at all times by measure:

There is no prynce but he hath nede of vs thre,
Welthe, with Measure, and plesaunt Lyberte. (159-60)

Unless Measure keeps Lyberte (Free-will) in check, there can be no Felycyte (19-21), nor indeed can Magnyfycence properly exist. The prince makes these conditions of his estate clear when he orders his household:

For dowllesse I parceyue my Magnyfycence
Without Measure lyghtly may fade,
Of to moche Lyberte vnder the offence;
Wherfore, Measure, take Lyberte with you hence,
And rule hym after the rule of your scole. (227-31)

Felycyte, Measure, and Lyberte are thus defined as the qualities which combine to form the "character" of Magnyfycence, and the action of the play outlines the process by which the prince's proper magnificence does fade when he

succumbs to temptation, thereby misusing his free-will or liberty. The vices of Skelton's play have a distinctively courtly cast, and in this respect they differ from the representations of the deadly sins in The Castle of Perseverance and Nature, although they bear some resemblance to the fashionable roisterers New-Guise, Nowadays and Naught in Mankind. Magnyfycence is undermined initially by capricious Fany, who presents himself as Largesse, "encrease of noble fame" (271). Four other conspirators, Counterfet Countenaunce, Crafty Conueyaunce, Clokyd Colusyon, and Courtly Abusyon, are introduced successively by Fany to the prince, and under their guidance he liberates Lyberte from the surveillance of Measure. Magnyfycence is reduced to the level of Foly, and Waste succeeds thrift in the kingdom (1444). Inevitably the prince is robbed of his felicity and is visited by Adversity and Poverty. Magnyfycence repents ("Alasse my Folly, alasse my wanton Wyll", 2062), is spurned by his false counsellors, and brought to a state of despair. Good Hope, Redresse, and Cyrcumspeccyon intervene through the grace of God to restore the balance of moral forces which had formerly existed in the character of the prince.

Skelton's play was almost certainly written between 1516 and 1518: the allusion in lines 279-82 to "Kynge Lewes of Fraunce", who died in 1515,¹⁷ is of the greatest importance, and Ramsay puts up a convincing case for the appropriateness of an English reference to French "largesse" within this period.¹⁸ The question of the extent to which

the action and characters of Magnyfycence mirror a real historical situation and actual people is a crucial one in any interpretation of the play, and it is necessary to raise it here in order to compare with Skelton's approach to historical fact the approach taken by Lindsay. With the exception of Winsor, all critics of the play have agreed substantially with the view set out in considerable detail by Ramsay, summarized here by Gordon:

Magnyfycence represents Henry VIII, and the vices and virtues in the play are the two parties among the councillors - those, headed by Wolsey, advocating a campaign of showy extravagance, and those in favour of a more economical policy, of whom the chief was Thomas Howard, the Earl of Surrey.¹⁹

The basic conflict of the play is between prudent thrift and foolish extravagance, and this is an accurate enough reflection of the conflict between Henry's advisers, one of the crises of which was Wolsey's victory over the moderate Howard party in 1516.²⁰ There is an allusion in one of Foly's speeches to "those .. that come vp of nought,/ As some be not ferre, and yf it were well sought", which is immediately followed by a reference to a particular upstart (1245-52). The self-conscious juggling of singular and plural pronouns does suggest that the satire had a particular target, and since the details of the gibe approximate to those in Skelton's later poetry which refer specifically to Wolsey,²¹ it is fair to assume that Foly alludes to him. Counterfet Countenaunce's reference earlier in the play to the "knokylbonyarde" and carter who "wyll counterfet a clarke" (480-86) also has a familiar ring.²² Ramsay suggests that the vices, between them, embody all of

Wolsey's faults as they are outlined by contemporary critics, including Skelton himself.²³ Although Skelton sets before his audience a particular historical situation, his method of portraying it dramatically is carefully generalized. The allusions to Wolsey, themselves ambiguous, are the nearest the play comes to detailed topical satire. Skelton was to become more outspoken later in his career, but in Magnyfycence he is most definitely using "metaphora, allegoria with all" as "his protectyon, his pauys, and his wall" (Speke, Parrot, 207). There is no single character who embodies Wolsey, and even Magnyfycence himself is not a detailed representation of Henry VIII. For Skelton's audience the inference to be drawn from a conflict between virtuous measure and vicious excess with a young ruler at its centre would have been clear enough. To have been more specific about the court situation of 1516 would probably have caused Skelton to suffer a fate similar to that of John Roo, the author of a satirical piece presented at Grey's Inn in 1526. Wolsey "imagined that the plaie had been diuised of hym", and had Roo packed off to the Fleet.²⁴ Skelton is careful to portray Magnyfycence along similar lines to earlier morality protagonists (with the exception, of course, of his rank): he is given no strong individuating characteristics, and the ease with which he is won over to the vices recalls the rapid falls of the protagonists in Mankind and Nature. At the end of the play Redresse and Cyrcumspeccyon announce a universal "sentence":

Vnto this processe brefly compylde,
 Comprehendynge the world casual and transytory,
 Who lyst to consyder shall neuer be begyld,
 Yf it be regystryd well in memory... (2505-8)

A myrrour incleryd is this interlude,
This life inconstant for to beholde and se. (2519-20)

By showing Magnyfycence being ruined by his evil counsellors the play is not, of course, representing historical fact, since Wolsey's policies at no stage resulted in total disaster for Henry. Rather, the toppling of the play-prince is intended as a "myrrour", a warning to Henry of what might well happen if he did not set his house in order.

Similarly, the reinstatement of Measure and the coming of Perseueraunce and Cyrcumspeccyon represent the poet's ambition for the future career of his sovereign and former pupil.

The fact that Skelton's play antedates Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis is beyond question. Lindsay's first poem dates from 1528 or shortly before, and the earliest date which has been proposed for the play, by John MacQueen, is "the thirties, even the twenties, rather than the fifties of the sixteenth century".²⁵ Before going on to discuss the resemblances between the two plays, some of which suggest strongly that the English work provided a source for Lindsay, it seems necessary to include at least some discussion of the dating of the surviving texts of Ane Satyre, since in recent criticism the questions of the play's date and the historical verisimilitude of its morality protagonist have been closely linked. The dating question is a complex one, and there is space here to consider only how the presentation of King Humanitie is relevant to the time of composition. Professor MacQueen's thesis that the play belongs in essence to the 1520's or

1530's rather than to the period shortly before the productions of 1552 and 1554 stems largely from a belief that the king in the play represents James V: in his view, it is inherently unlikely that Lindsay would have expanded the portrait of the king in the 1540 Linlithgow "interlude" for a play to be performed nearly a decade after James's death as a result of Solway Moss. MacQueen points out that the play contains several direct quotations from poems written by Lindsay in the period 1528-30, poems which are specifically directed at the youthful James.²⁶ Anna Jean Mill and Vernon Harward, favouring a date in the middle of the century for the surviving texts, argue that King Humanitie is not to be identified precisely with James V, but rather that he represents a generalized and idealized King of Scots.²⁷ They allow for a partial identification with James, the king whom the playwright knew so well in his own lifetime: Harward suggests,

that Lindsay found a congruence between the erring young King of Scots in past history and the traditional morality protagonist. King Humanitie is not to be identified specifically with James V, although the latter shared the youthfulness and indulgence of his predecessors and of the morality protagonist.²⁸

Although there is undoubtedly this combination of generality and historical reality in the portrait of King Humanitie, the former should not be stressed at the expense of the latter. The presentation of the character reflects the poet-historian's invitation to his audience to see in his career certain parallels to the career of James V. Lindsay's Complaynt, which is specifically addressed to the king, warns against evil courtiers who encourage immoderate

sexual behaviour (199-210). James is known to have had at least five mistresses, all with powerful family connections,²⁹ so the warning against unbridled appetite, repeated in Ane Satyre, clearly had some point. It is interesting to observe that Pitscottie, like Lindsay, identifies sexual indulgence with misgovernance and ill counsel: he observes that if James had "ressawit goode consall of wyse and godlie men and spetiallie of his great lordis and keipit his body frome harlotrie and had left the evill consall of his papistis bischopis and gredie courteouris, he had ben the most nobillist prince that ever rang in the realme of Scottland."³⁰ MacQueen is right to indicate that Correctioun's advice to the play king, to be chaste until a suitable "Queene of blude-royall" is found (1745-9), is "very relevant to the period before James's first marriage in 1537."³¹ The play alludes not only to the seduction and wantonness of the historical figure, but also to the influence which the clergy had upon him: Flatterie undermines King Humanitie in the play by adopting the disguise of a friar, and his masters are the corrupt prelacy. James's failure to shake off the counsels of prelate-courtiers, and the ruinous consequences of Church power, are discussed in some detail by J.S. Kantrowitz.³²

The religious abuses which are satirized in both parts of the play (but especially in the second part) are those of the middle years of the century rather than of an earlier generation, the difference being in the scale rather than in the substance of the abuses. Nevertheless, it is

possible that the portrait of King Humanitie originated in an earlier version of the play. In this context, it may be significant that Ane Satyre should imply the presence of a king in Scotland. At the beginning Diligence explains that "hee lang tyme hes bene sleipand" in misruled youth (24-7). By contrast, The Buke of the Monarche, written between 1548 and 1553, refers explicitly to the kingless state of the realm (Epistel, 10). There is a strong possibility that Lindsay revised an earlier version of the play, written before the death of James V, a version in which there may have been references to the king as specific as that contained in the 1540 interlude summarized in Sir William Eure's "Nootes".³³ Why, though, should Lindsay have alluded to the career of a king who by 1552 had been dead for a decade? I suggest that the dramatic presentation of a prince who is at first subverted and then restored to the position of just governor, capable of redressing widespread moral disorder with the aid of Divine Correction, was intended to remind the Cupar audience of what James should have accomplished. The king plays a very small part in the second part of the play, which is concerned with the stamping out of that corruption among the three estates which had been exacerbated by the death of James V. It is important to see this part of the play in perspective. Lindsay's fundamental desire is for reform: before 1542 he had trusted in the king to reform his own life as a prelude to the establishment of a just Christian commonwealth, but in the absence of a king the regeneration of society must nevertheless take place. It may be that in depicting

this process Lindsay was suggesting to his audience that the presence of a woman ruler (Mary of Guise) was an obstacle to its achievement in real life. In the Monarchie he writes,

Ladyis in no way I can commend
Presumptuouslye quhilk doith pretend
Tyll vse the office of ane kyng,
Or Realmes tak in gouernyng, (3247-50)

and returns to the theme of reformation under a male ruler,

I traist to se gude reformatione
From tyme we gett ane faithfull prudent king
Quhilk knawis the treuth and his vocatione. (2605-7)

Lindsay may have developed the idea of creating a play king who exhibits characteristics of an historical monarch from Skelton's idealized portrayal of a real historical figure in Magnyfycence. Like Skelton, Lindsay exploits the conventions of the morality play, in particular those which govern the presentation of the morality protagonist, creating a universal statement about the uses and abuses of authority from a real situation. Skelton's major innovation is in the adaptation of morality conventions to a topical situation, and Lindsay would no doubt have recognized the potentialities of the method. In Magnyfycence, Skelton creates a speculum for a living prince, and it is likely that an early version of Ane Satyre also offered covert advice to a Scots ruler. The portrait of King Humanitie, like that of Magnyfycence, is a blend of historical realism and generality: the difference between the two is that the model for Lindsay's character is more readily identifiable.

The broad structural pattern of the various stages of

the protagonist's career - innocence, temptation, fall and misrule, correction and repentance - is common to Magnyfycence and Ane Satyre, but it would be rash to suggest that Lindsay borrowed this from Skelton, since it is the framework of all the "mankind" morality plays. The prominence given to the physical presence of Sensualitie in Lindsay's play is more reminiscent of Medwall's Nature than of Magnyfycence, where the lady is only referred to. It is very likely, however, that some of the details of Humanitie's seduction are developed from the scene in Magnyfycence where Courtly Abusyon succeeds in arousing the prince's sexual curiosity. In both plays, the inexperienced rulers are seduced by the sugary rhetoric of their false advisers rather than by the conventional means of Presence and Sweet-Looking. Skelton carefully draws attention to the extravagance of Courtly Abusyon's rhetoric through the compliment paid by the rapt Magnyfycence - "Pullyshed and fresshe is your ornacy" (1529-31). There is a strong element of parody in the following speech, where the elevated rhetoric of courtly love is twisted to serve the designs of the procurer:

.. fasten your Fansy vpon a fayre maystresse
 That quyckly is enuyued with rudynes of the rose,
 Inpurtured with fetures after your purpose,
 The streynes of her vaynes as asure inde blewe,
 Enbudded with beautye and colour fresshe of hewe,
 As lyly whyte to loke vpon her leyre,
 Her eyen relucient as carbuncle so clere,
 Her mouthe enbawmyd, dylectable, and mery,
 Her lusty lyppes ruddy as the chery .. (1550-58)

The effect is rounded off by the crudely enthusiastic vigour of the prince's reply (1560-69). There is a very similar juxtaposition of high and low styles in the descriptions

of the lady with which Solace and Placebo ply King

Humanitie: e.g.,

To luik on hir is great delyte,
 With lippis reid and cheikis quhyte
 I wald renunce all this warld quyte
 For till stand in hir grace:
 Scho is wantoun and scho is wyse
 And cled scho is on the new gyse
 It wald gar all 3our flesche vp ryse,
 To luik on hir face. (198-205)

That perfyt patron of plesance,
 Ane perle of pulchritude:
 Soft as the silk is hir quhite lyre,
 Hir hair is like the goldin wyre:
 My hart burnis in ane flame of fyre
 I sweir 3ow be the Rude.

.....
 War 3e weill leirnit at luifis lair
 And syne had hir anis sene,
 I wait, be cokis passioun,
 3e wald mak supplicatioun,
 And spend on hir ane millioun.
 Hir lufe for till obtaine. (339-52)

There is, of course, the semi-dramatic account of temptat-
 ion and procuration in Lindsay's Complaynt (237-52), but
 the rhetoric of the scene in Ane Satyre is considerably
 more elaborate. Both plays present their audiences with
 the unedifying spectacle of ruler rewarding panders in ex-
 change for securing female favours: King Humanitie, like
 Magnyfycence, has to be told about the necessity for pay-
 ment (Satyre, 397-405; cf. Magnyfycence, 1570-82). Skel-
 ton's parodic effects pale into insignificance beside the
 triumphant introit of Sensualitie ("Luifers awalk! behald
 the fyrie spheir"),³⁴ although in fairness to Skelton it
 should be said that the introduction of a similar figure
 would have undermined his play's emphasis on fiscal moral-
 ity. There is sufficient resemblance between the two
 temptation scenes - the pandering efforts of false courtiers
 who seduce by rhetoric, the undercutting of the elaborate

language by crude reality - to suggest that the scenes which explore Humanitie's affair with Sensualitie may have grown out of the exchange between Magnyfycence and Courtly Abusyon.

The influence of Skelton's play upon Ane Satyre is also to be discerned in the relationship between the two groups of Vices. Just as Skelton replaces the traditional mankind hero with a type character representing secular authority, so too he changes the representatives and agents of Sin in the earlier morality plays into types of specifically courtly abuse. Fanny, the embodiment of hare-brained irresponsibility and the instigator of the prince's downfall, introduces himself as a courtier - "Yet amonge noble men I was brought vp and bred" (261) - and posing as Largesse he is made a knight (520-21). The four vices represent current varieties of social evil whose highest aspiration is to subvert and dispossess those of high rank: it is no accident that these figures have counterparts in Skelton's satire of court life, The Bowge of Courte. When Folly appears, he too boasts that his greatest achievement is to bring into his company "cayser.. or kynge" (1215-46). In Ane Satyre, Flatterie, Falset, and Dissait represent similar kinds of social evil to which court life is especially prone. That Dissait is intended to be recognized as a courtier is clear by the allusion to his apparel (676-7). At the end of the play, their accomplice Folie boasts of his power over "princelie and imperiall fuillis" (4558). It is interesting to observe that like Skelton, Lindsay

depicts his vice characters in such a way that the wide-ranging consequences of regal misrule are amplified. In Magnyfycence, the conspirators are given monologues in which their effect on the body politic is made abundantly clear. Counterfet Countenaunce's "bastarde ryme", for example, explores the pervasiveness of counterfeit moral values: merchants, courtiers, tradesmen, maidens, wives, and clerics alike are intent upon deceiving others in all that they do or say (410-93). Later, one of his fellows, representing an even more sinister kind of falsehood, boasts,

By Cloked Colusyon, I say, and none other,
Comberaunce and trouble in Englande fyrst I began.
(714-15)

In the first part of Ane Satyre, the corruption among the Three Estates which is explored fully in the second part of the play, is highlighted by the particular social connections of each of the vices. Dissait is "counsallour to the Merchand-men" (656), to whom he flees at the coming of King Correctioun (1520-25), when Flatterie and Falset go to dwell with the spiritual estate and the "men of craft" respectively (1514-19, 1529-31). The point is visually underlined in the second part of the play, when the trio reappear leading the Three Estates "gangand backward". Lindsay represents the sins of the realm in a direct and concrete way in a play which has a much wider scope than Magnyfycence, but nevertheless his method of alluding to the illnesses of society in Part I is very close to the method of Skelton's play.

It is very likely that Lindsay's use of the disguise device owes something to Skelton's practice. Disguise is, of course, one of the standard elements in the emergence of drama, and in earlier morality plays it is frequently used to illustrate the idea of Evil's superficial attractiveness. In Wisdom, for example, Lucifer appears wearing the dress of a devil over a flashy gallant's robe, explaining to the audience that when he removes his "proper" habit, Anima will be seduced by his glorious brightness. In Nature, the Seven Deadly Sins assume euphemistic aliases in order to deceive Mankind: e.g., Pride becomes "Worship", Wrath, "Manhood", and Sloth, "Ease".³⁵ Skelton's contribution to the morality disguise topos is to increase both the element of "business" and the moral implications of the physical disguise. As Ann Wierum shows, Skelton's exploitation of disguise as costume, rather than as simple name-changing, goes further than earlier uses of the theatrical metaphor.³⁶ When Skelton's Clokyd Colusyon enters for the first time, the others pretend not to be able to recognize him because he is wearing clerical garb:

Se howe he is wrapped for the colde.
Is it not a vestment? (603)

Tushe! it is Syr John Double-Cope. (605)

To match his physical disguise, the others give him the alias "Sober Sadnesse" (681). The element of play-acting which accompanies the changes of name and costume is emphasized in the scenes in which the vices discuss their new identities in tones of delighted self-satisfaction (e.g., 516-28, 669-84). Lindsay takes over the Skeltonic

FALSET. I gif 3ow all the Deuilis of hell. (787-9)
Parodies of ritual are of course common in late medieval literature, and it would be risky to propose Skelton's lines as source for this particular passage.

Both plays exploit the comic potential inherent in the "play-acting" of the conspirators. In Magnyfycence, the appearance of Counterfet Countenaunce before his appointed time threatens to overturn Fany's attempt to subvert the prince. Magnyfycence, who has accepted Fany's claim to be Largesse and is about to read the counterfeit letter, overhears Counterfet Countenaunce as he tries to attract the attention of his accomplice. For one perilous moment it seems that Magnyfycence will trust his own ears rather than accept Fany's explanation that the voice called to "a Flemynge hyght Hansy" (328), but Fany succeeds in quelling his doubts (330). Again Counterfet Countenaunce risks discovery, by appearing just as Fany is about to depart with the deluded prince, with the result that he is furiously rebuked (396-400). In Ane Satyre, similarly, the plot is threatened at its inception through the ineptitude of one of the plotters, Falset, who forgets his new name at the crucial moment of his introduction to Humanitie. After three questions from the king about his identity, Falset frantically ad-libs - "Marie thay call me thin drink I trow" (853) - and eventually Flatterie has to introduce him. As in Magnyfycence, the situation is saved only by some ingenious rhetoric (862-7). Wierum remarks on the close similarity between these two comic scenes,³⁷ appar-

ently without reckoning on the indebtedness of one to the other. There can be little doubt that Lindsay improves upon his model - his scene is, by any standards, funnier than Skelton's - but in both the comic effect is part of a suspense technique.³⁸

The association of fool characters with Vices in the two plays constitutes another important parallel between them. A.J. Mill, relating the sermon of Folie at the end of Part II of Ane Satyre to the sermon joyeux of contemporary French drama,³⁹ suggests that the English morality was comparatively uninfluenced by fool literature.⁴⁰ Here she overlooks the fools in Magnyfycence, and like subsequent commentators fails to notice that in both Skelton's play and Ane Satyre the physical presence of court fools is vital to the dramatic presentation of folly in kingship. In Lindsay's play, just as in Skelton's, there are two fool characters, specifically court fools rather than merely the adherents to certain kinds of folly or sin who are satirized in Brant's Narrenschiff and its various translations. There are unmistakable allusions in Magnyfycence to the court-fool's garb worn by Fansy and Foly: e.g., Foly greets his brother, "What, frantyeke Fansy! in a foles case?" (1047), and a little later one of the other characters makes a remark which reveals that Foly is similarly attired (1177). Both characters carry purses or wallets (347, 1103), and in one scene they are accompanied by animals (923, 1044), "the natural appurtenances for the domestic or court fool".⁴¹ Their speech, too, marks them

as members of the class of professional fools. When Fansy first enters, he addresses the prince in the tones of insolent familiarity permitted only to a court fool, and later he explains to Crafty Conueyaunce that Foly will treat Magnyfycence in the same way (1168-9). Ramsay observes that there is an important difference between Skelton's two fools: Fansy is a type of the natural fool, "frantye" and wildly capricious by nature, whereas Foly is an allowed fool, one who has sufficient intellect to assume the guise of the buffoon in order to make fools of others.⁴² It is Foly who brings Magnyfycence to his moral nadir, entertaining him with a torrent of sheer nonsense (1803-42). The significance of this spectacle, in which the prince plays the fool (1805), is explained by Foly's boast,

it is I that foles can make;
For be he cayser or be he kynge,
To felowshyp with Foly I can hym brynge. (1214-16)

Reducing the allegory to its simplest terms, Fansy is temptation, whereas Foly denotes the state of fallen man itself (cf. 1294-6).

The characters Flatterie and Folie in Ane Satyre are closely related to Skelton's Fansy and Foly. Flatterie's boisterous entry leaves no doubt that he is playing the part of the court fool: e.g.,

Quhat say ze sirs am I nocht gay?
Se ze not Flatterie, 3our awin fuill,
That zeid to mak this new array?
Was I not heir with 3ow at 3uill? (628-31)

Like Fansy in Magnyfycence, he regales his listeners with

a racy anecdote about the dangers he has passed through in order to be present. Flatterie's account of his dangerous sea journey has the same outrageous tone as Fansy's story about escaping from France (Satyre, 603-35; cf. Magnyfycence, 347-61). Like Fansy, Flatterie is actively engaged in conspiracy: in both plays, the fool-conspirators take the initiative in the process of deceiving the rulers. They are the first of the Vice characters to appear, and it is they who set the conspiracy in motion. The fool's guile is praised by Counterfet Countenaunce,

Fansy hath cacyd in a flye net,
This noble man Magnyfycence, (403-4)

and in Ane Satyre the whole idea of the disguise plot is hatched by Flatterie (719-24). Lindsay's fool does not, admittedly, have the caprice which marks Fansy as a specific kind of court fool. Indeed, Flatterie has more in common with Skelton's Clokyd Colusyon, who, also disguised as a friar, achieves his ends by a similar means:

To flater and to flery is all my pretence
Among all suche persones as I well vnderstonde
Be lyght of byleue and hasty of credence. (738-40)

Lindsay's second fool, Folie, is also immediately recognizable as a court entertainer: when he first enters towards the end of the play, he expects recognition from the lords in the audience (4272-9), and later he produces from his purse a "pilllok" with which to divert the ladies. The latter is clearly a variant of the traditional fool's bauble.⁴³ Folie affects an insolent style of address to those in authority (4316-17), like the two fools in Skel-

ton's play. It is interesting to observe that, like his namesake in Magnyfycence, Folie feigns dumbness and stupidity when it suits him to do so. Here Diligence attempts to make him rise and hasten to the king:

DIL. Get vp. Me think the carle is dum
FOL. Now bum balerie bum bum. (4400-1)

This exchange recalls the dialogue between Foly and Fansy in which Foly feigns deafness in order to parry his companion's indignant enquiries about the dog (Magnyfycence, 1059-66, 1085-97). It would be rash to suggest that Lindsay needed literary precedents to enable him to depict the antics of a court fool, since he would have been quite familiar with the behaviour of fools in the Scottish royal household.⁴⁴ It seems quite likely though, that Lindsay was impressed by the idea of putting court fools into a play, and that he recognized the dramatic force of the Skeltonic distinction between two kinds of stage court fool. In Ane Satyre, Flatterie represents a particular kind of folly, to which those in high places are particularly susceptible, whereas Folie is the embodiment of a wide range of sinful inclinations. The essential difference between the allegorical significations of the two figures is highlighted in dramatic terms by Folie's entry as soon as Flatterie departs in search of new pupils (4271). Folie's sermon (4466-4512) and the subsequent dialogue with Diligence (4513-4612) make it abundantly clear that Folie is a composite of all the vices: he sells "Folie Hats" not only to flatterers, but also to lechers, pilferers, and the followers of Pride in all its forms among the

three estates. Folie's whole "self-revelation" is reminiscent of the passage in Magnyfycence in which Foly boasts about the various kinds of fools who flock to his "scolys" (1220-34, 1239-52). "Princelie and imperiall fuillis" are singled out for special attention in the last stage of Folie's address (4554-95), where he exults in his power over even the greatest temporal rulers. There is here a strong echo of the claim made by Skelton's figure:

For be he cayser or be he kynge,
To felowshyp with Foly I can hym brynge.

Lindsay's Folie is fearlessly topical in his references to European potentates, and although his counterpart in Skelton's play names no names the allusion to "they that come vp of nought" could hardly have been seen as general satire by the contemporary audience. The parallel between the sermon form of Folie's address and the French sermon joyeux should, as A.J. Mill suggests, be kept in mind, but it should also be remembered that Skelton's Foly casts himself in the role of the preacher, without actually using the sermon form in the play. This is clearly implied by the account of how he wins over the gullible - "Fyrst I lay before them my bybyll.. " (1221). There is nothing especially novel in the message about the pervasiveness of Folly, nor even in the definition of Folly as a composite of all sinful inclinations,⁴⁵ but the insistence in both plays upon the prevalence of Folly in royal courts, put in the mouth of the Vice himself, does suggest very strongly that Lindsay was influenced by Skelton. Because Folie's speech is placed at the very end of Ane Satyre - i.e., after

the establishment of social and moral order - it has the significance of a warning that justice will not prevail unless all grades of society make a proper use of free-will. This moralitas, of course, plays no part in Skelton's treatment of the character.

In Ane Satyre, as in Magnyfycence, the subversion of the prince proceeds from a misuse of his free will. King Humanitie rebukes his false servants for their advice, affirming both his obedience to God and his readiness to make his own moral decisions:

Becaus I haue bene to this day

Tanquam tabula rasa:

That is als mekill as to say,

Redie for gude and ill.

(223-6)

Skelton's ruler is also tanquam tabula rasa, and the first scene of the play develops the idea that his capacity to follow the Good depends upon the maintenance of a proper relationship between Wealth, Measure, and Liberty. This first scene illustrates the conflict within Magnyfycence between Liberty and Restraint, at the same time as it illustrates two opposing theories of statecraft. Liberty's recalcitrance (205-10, 232) is a clear portent of the prince's susceptibility. This scene has a counterpart in the first episode of Ane Satyre, where Humanitie is easily won over by his "Wantonnes" to the society of Sensualitie: Wantonnes, Placebo and Solace represent both easy-living courtiers and the propensities of the central morality character. The action of both plays demonstrates that initial blindness and wilfulness - in Magnyfycence, a

disposition towards liberty, and in Ane Satyre, a fondness for sexual indulgence - are inevitably followed by errors of judgement which endanger the very position and authority of the ruler. Although Skelton does not introduce the physical equivalent of Lindsay's Sensualitie into his play, he places some emphasis on the undesirable preoccupation with the flesh which follows when the restraint of Measure is removed: when Lyberte appears after having been "liberated" by the conspirators, he is singing a bawdy song (2064-77). Lindsay follows Skelton in ascribing a "neutral" moral quality to the defects of his young monarch.

Lyberte's explanation of his own nature,

For I am a vertue yf I be well vsed,
And I am a vyce where I am abused (2101-2),

is relevant also to the minions of Lindsay's king. A prince must be permitted some liberty, but desire or will must always submit to the restraint of the divinely-appointed faculty of Reason or Measure. King Humanitie's error, like that of Magnyfycence, lies in his failure to recognize the need for restraint: Wantonnes and Solace are not in themselves vicious tendencies, providing that they are not abused, thereby preparing the way for the assaults of more serious vices. Correction is prepared to recognize sexuality, providing that it is kept within lawful bounds (1745-9), and he is surprisingly lenient in his treatment of Wantonnes and Solace (1842-50). This implicit distinction between natural impulses, in themselves only potentially vicious, and the active vice or folly which proceeds from immoderation, constitutes one of the most

important parallels between the allegorical schemes of the two plays.

A further similarity between the plots of Magnyfycence and Ane Satyre is that both incorporate physical confrontations between good and evil counsellors, in which the latter are victorious. Having deluded Magnyfycence, Clokyd Colusyon and Courtly Abusyon proceed to displace Measure, who seeks to approach the prince through the intercession of Clokyd Colusyon. The false courtier confesses his ruse to Magnyfycence, explains that the suppliant is not "mete" company for him (1652-3), with the result that Measure is unceremoniously banished. In the corresponding scene in Ane Satyre, Humanitie, who like Magnyfycence has been beguiled by false appearance, empowers his new officials to treat with Gude Counsell. The vices, of course, have no intention of allowing him to approach the royal presence, and "thay hurle away Gude-Counsall" (928-77). Humanitie, although negligent, is less culpable than Skelton's prince, since he does not know the identity of the wronged adviser. The idea of banishment plays a much more important part in Lindsay's play, since the scene involving Gude Counsell is followed by similar episodes in which Veritie and Chastitie are forcibly prevented from coming to the king.

Again at the level of action, it is interesting to observe that Lindsay follows Skelton in portraying the young king's false advisers as common thieves. Magnyfycence is robbed not only of his "Felycyte" (1864), but also

of his money and silver plate (2163-8): this of course is particularly appropriate in a play which articulates a distinctively fiscal morality. When Lindsay's vices know that reformation is at hand, Flatterie makes a rapid exit, while Falset and Dissait steal the king's box: says Falset,

Lo heir the Box now let vs ga:
This may suffice for our rewairds. (1544-5)

In Ane Satyre, as in Magnyfycence, the theft of royal property is followed by a brawl. Clokyd Colusyon and Crafty Conueyaunce have a heated argument about which of them is the more daring thief (2171-97), and they are soon joined by Counterfet Countenaunce (2198-236): Falset and Dissait fall to abuse and clouts over a similar issue of priority, and eventually Dissait captures the box (1556-71). Lindsay goes further than Skelton by introducing a character called Thift, whose spiritual affinity with the two courtiers is dramatically illustrated in the hanging scene of Part II. The two "theft" scenes are, however, close enough in spirit to suggest that one influenced the other.

The most important parallels between Magnyfycence and Ane Satyre are features which are sufficiently striking in terms of the development of the morality genre to suggest that Lindsay adapted and borrowed from Skelton's play. Such features include the choice of a theme which is predominantly secular and political rather than religious, the depiction of an idealized yet recognizably real king

as morality protagonist, the method by which he is tempted, the distinctive characteristics of the vices, the predominance given to the theme of folly, and various details of dramatic action. In discussing these parallels, I have perhaps given the impression that the plays are much more alike than in fact they are, so it is necessary for the sake of balance to give some attention to the crucial differences between the Scottish play and the English work which constitutes a source for its first part.

Magnyfycence is, above all, a morality play: structurally, it focusses attention on the fall and regeneration of a single figure. Considered as a whole, Lindsay's play is considerably longer (by some 2000 lines), and in its second part it moves away from the morality emphasis on the regeneration of a single figure to the broader issue of the whole regeneration of society. The major event of Part II is of course the summoning by Correctioun of a parliament of the three estates. Characters from the first part figure prominently in the "social" action of the second: the vices Flatterie, Falset, and Dissait reappear in new roles, as leaders of the three estates, and later two of them are spectacularly hanged; Sensualitie figures prominently as the companion of Spiritualitie; Veritie and Chastitie are freed from the stocks and come to seek redress from King Humanitie; Gude Counsell fulfils the function denied to him by the misguided king in the first part of the play, and Diligence plays an active part in the setting up of the new regime. Ane Satyre is a much more

comprehensive play than Magnyfycence, in terms of theme, characterization and technical variety. Skelton's play is not entirely devoid of social satire, but its main emphasis is upon the desirability of circumspection and the folly of extravagance in the area of fiscal morality. This narrowness of thematic focus largely accounts for the unattractiveness of the play to modern readers, although surely few would go as far as the eighteenth century critic who dismissed it curtly as "the dullest play ever written".⁴⁶

Ramsay, whose appreciation of the work is both scholarly and sensitive, comments on the first page of his Introduction:

To the Tudor audience doubtless the chief interest lay in its political satire; but this is obscure and dull beside that of the Scottish political morality, Lyndsay's Three Estates.

Having read the plays together, one finds it difficult to avoid the conclusion that Lindsay appreciated the originality of a political morality with a ruler as its central character, and decided to write a play which was much more incisively political and satirical. His play is first and foremost a national drama which enfolds in its wide sweep all the major corruptions and injustices of sixteenth century Scottish society.

In comparison with Ane Satyre, Magnyfycence is not really a national drama at all. Skelton nods in the general direction of religious abuse and social discord,⁴⁷ but his play contains no character who is comparable with John the Common-Weill or the Pauper. Although Lindsay follows

Skelton to the extent of portraying his king as a generalized and rather shadowy figure, the Scots play is in other ways much more detailed and more topical in its treatment of the contemporary scene. In the second part of Ane Satyre there is an exhaustive attack on the privilege and corruption of the Church: simony, pluralism, incontinence and ignorance are all alleged against Spiritualitie. This kind of satire is foreshadowed by the first part of the play, where Lindsay goes so far as to single out a particular religious house ("Speir at the Monks of Bamirrinoch,/ Gif lecherie be sin", 261-2). At another level, the peculiar injustices of the Scottish systems of land tenure (2571-7) and of justice (3053-84) are decried, and the necessary reforms outlined. There are references to domestic discord in the borders (2582-6) and to the state of international politics (3562-3, 4568-79), and there is an allusion to the French aid given to Scotland for her defence against England in 1547 (4564-7). The play abounds in Scottish place and personal names, many of which anchor the surviving printed text firmly to the outdoor production at Cupar.⁴⁸

It is perhaps unfair to compare the whole of Ane Satyre with Magnyfycence, since its second part - which Diligence calls "The best pairt of our play" - is completely different in scope and spirit from anything Skelton ever wrote. But even if we compare only Part I of Ane Satyre with the English work it is clear that Lindsay's play is incontestably superior in vigour and dramatic variety.

Lindsay may have learned from the deficiencies of Skelton's play that a sense of dialogue and dramatic interaction are crucial to the life of drama. Magnyfycence contains a large number of monologues, most of which are "self-revelations" on the part of the vices, and although these make interesting reading, they are indeed "tedious" from a theatrical point of view.⁴⁹ In the Scots play, on the other hand, the number of monologues is kept to a minimum: of the vices, Flatterie alone is allowed to take the stage himself, and his introductory speech (602-34) is not so much a monologue as an exuberant greeting to a familiar audience. Veritie's long speech later in the play is also in the nature of an exchange with her listeners (1026-77), and it is given further dramatic impetus because the last part of it is overheard by Flatterie. The fact that soliloquies are kept to an absolute minimum makes the dignified speech of Divine Correctioun (1572-620) all the more impressive. One of Lindsay's major innovations lies in consolidating Skelton's array of traditional proponents of punishment and reform - Aduersyte, Pouerte, Good Hope, Redress, Cyrcumspeccyon, Perseueraunce - into the single majestic figure of Divine Correctioun. Magnyfycence suffers from the weakness that in the last two scenes attention is deflected from the issue of proper princely conduct to the more general ethical topics of punishment, remorse, and regeneration. Lindsay bypasses entirely the traditional descent of the morality protagonist into despair, concentrating instead on the correction of King Humanitie. Instead of showing, as Skelton does, a lengthy account of

the punishment of his misguided ruler, Lindsay shows

Correctioun threatening Humanitie with punishment:

I haue power greit Princes to doun thring,
That liues contrair the Maiestie Divyne,
Against the treuth quhilk plainlie dois maling:
Repent they nocht I put them to ruyne. (1713-16)

Correctioun's contemptuous dismissal of Sensualitie is sufficient warning, and the subsequent docility of Humanitie is just as effective as a token of a reformed spirit as a lengthy speech would have been (cf. Magnyfycence, 2498-504). It is to Lindsay's credit that he does not attempt to imitate the extended passages of joking and argument among the vices by which Skelton attempts to inject an element of humour into his play. The comedy of the disguise scenes in Ane Satyre is part verbal, part comedy of action, and to this is added the farcical interlude in which the wives of the sowter and the tailor "ding thair gudemen" and "chase away Chastitie". The disguise theme which is used to such good effect in Part I to portray the gulling of Humanitie is used again in the second part of the play, once more to expose in visual terms the folly of hypocrisy. This time the reverse process, that of unmasking, is carried out: Flatterie has his hood and gown removed by the Sergeant, so that his true identity is plain to all (3643-5); the Prioress is revealed as a whore (3649-56), and in the most striking unmasking scene of all, the three prelates are discovered to be "verie fuillis", the true companions of Flatterie (3723-6). Clearly, this exploitation of the costume disguise device has an effect which surpasses that of its first use in the conspiracy of Part I. Skelton does

not utilize the theatrical and didactic potential of the disguise theme: he is content that his vices should be "discovered" at a purely literal level (1859-72).

Although he insists that Ane Satyre is, in terms of political satire and sheer theatricality, a better play than Magnyfycence, Ramsay holds to the view that Skelton's play is "incontestably superior" in terms of its construction.⁵⁰ It is true that the "action" of Magnyfycence is carefully designed to illustrate the successive stages of the protagonist's career, but it does not follow that this balanced and mathematically logical form is superior to the much less restrained approach of Ane Satyre. Lindsay's introduction of the farcical "interluyde" involving the wives of the Sowtar and the Tailor has nothing to do with the main theme of Humanitie's reformation, but it is dramatically appropriate because it provides comic relief and at the same time broadens the social dimensions of the play. The same can be said of the episode of the Old Man and his wife in the Cupar banns (preserved by Bannatyne), and it is important to note that even this hilariously farcical episode carries a moral which is highly relevant to both parts of the play: in the words of the Clerk, "Thay ar not sonsy that so dois ruse thame sell" (181). The episodes which involve the Pauper, the Pardoner, and the Sowtar and his wife, reveal corruption of various kinds in Church and State, and hence are important as illustrations of themes which are raised in a less naturalistic context elsewhere in the play. Nowhere do elements of

crude humour and farce undermine the seriousness of Lindsay's plea for reform and hence lay the play open to the charge of structural imbalance. The fact that Magnyfycence has fewer characters than the Scots play (even after allowing for the practice of "doubling" which Lindsay may well have followed) can hardly be an argument for its greater structural cohesiveness. In terms of lucid plot construction, Ane Satyre is in no way inferior to Magnyfycence, despite the fact that the "raw materials" of the Scottish plot are much more diverse. It need hardly be stressed that Lindsay's play includes characters and scenes which have no counterpart in Skelton's morality because its whole raison d'être - the need for wide reform throughout various grades of society - is much more ambitious and more complex than the moral impulse underlying Skelton's play.

Despite the differences between Magnyfycence and the first part of Ane Satyre, there are parallels which are sufficiently close to suggest that Lindsay knew the English morality play and reworked some of its themes and techniques to accord with his own conception of a play about royal reform. There is evidence to suggest that Lindsay made similar use of Gringore's Jeu du Prince des Sotz (acted in Paris in 1511) as a source for his "estates" drama. The French play exhibits some of the main features of Lindsay's work: satire of corruption in Church and State, presented through the dramatic spectacle of a parliament or court presided over by a king, to which comes the oppressed figure of Commonwealth (La Commune) to

protest against the misdemeanours and the rapaciousness of the Clergy and the Seigneurs (Spiritualitie and Temporalitie). Many of the complaints alleged against the ecclesiastical and secular estates recur in the Scots play.⁵¹

It is quite likely that the figure of Divine Correction is modelled on Pugnacion Divine in Gringore's Moralité.

Lindsay uses the work of Gringore in much the same way that he uses Skelton's Magnyfycence, taking from it a novel idea - in this case, an assembly of the estates in which the commons appeal to the king for redress of their wrongs - and adapting this to fit into the context of a reform drama more closely applicable to the situation in Scotland. Ane Satyre surpasses the sources of both its first and second parts in terms of variety, humour, and satirical incisiveness.

Several critics have detected the influence of Lindsay's panoramic play in a variety of sixteenth century English dramas advocating religious and social reform. The attitude of mind which has predisposed commentators to find traces of Lindsayan themes, characters, and techniques in English plays is summed up in this comment by J.A. Lester:

The Scotchman's play was trenchant and witty to a degree far surpassing contemporary English drama, and attacked abuses which did not exist alone north of the border, but were objects of satire in every country which felt the Reformation. It would, then, be strange if Ward's opinion, that this work was without influence on contemporary English drama, were founded on fact.⁵²

With one probable exception (of which more below), A.W.

Ward's view that Lindsay's play did not influence secular drama in the south does represent an accurate picture.⁵³ The play most frequently singled out as exhibiting the influence of Ane Satyre is John Bale's Kynge Johan: Brandl was the first to suggest that this play was modelled on the Scots work, and his views were accepted by other critics, including Lester.⁵⁴ Historical fact poses an insurmountable obstacle to this theory, unless one can believe that Ane Satyre was written in the 1530's, since Kynge Johan existed before 1536, the date of Bale's Anglorum Heliades, which includes in the list of his own works notice of the play "Pro Rege Ioanne".⁵⁵ Even if Lindsay's play did exist in substantially its present form at an early date, Bale would have to have seen it very soon after its composition in order to have been influenced by it. If Bale did know of the existence of Ane Satyre, it is curious that he makes no reference to it in the entry on Lindsay in his Index Britanniae Scriptorum (1549-57). Kynge Johan was expanded and altered at least once after 1536,⁵⁶ but it is impossible to speculate about the possible influence of Ane Satyre upon the revisions because we do not know how extensively these affected the early play.

Hamer finds the similarities which have been adduced between Kynge Johan and Ane Satyre to be tenuous at best: "I find no trace of similarity with Ane Satyre beyond a common hatred of Church abuses, the wrongs of the poor, the name of Verity, and the fact that both plays were written in two parts".⁵⁷ Bale's choice of a chronicle form (an

innovation in English secular drama) to a large extent dictates his choice of characters. It is difficult to imagine that a play which purports to depict the struggle between monarchy and the Church in the reign of the "historical" King John could have been written without representations of Prelacy, Nobility, and Commons. Bale's extensive use of disguise suggests the literary influence of Skelton. (As in Magnyfycence, the imposters have polysyllabic double names: Sedition dupes the estates in the clerical disguise of "Good Perfeccyon", and Dissimulation assumes the alias "Monastycall Devocyon" in the scene in which he poisons the king.) The most striking parallel between Bale's play and Ane Satyre - the fact that both are "estates" dramas - might lead one to conjecture that the second part of the Scots work had been influenced by Bale, were it not for the existence of the much stronger link between Ane Satyre and Gringore's play.

Considered as propaganda for the Tudor split with Rome, Bale's play must be conceded a certain crude effectiveness. Yet simply because it is a propaganda piece, there are very few points of contact with Ane Satyre. The hour of the Protestant reformation had not yet come in Scotland when Lindsay wrote his play, and although he directs some keen criticisms at the Papacy and the higher clergy he never descends, as Bale does, to vilifying the Old Religion. Lindsay is not the servant of a particular regime or a set of doctrines, and his satire is more comprehensive, in terms of both tone and social range. There

is no place for humour and compassion in Bale's zealous Protestant Weltanschauung. F.P. Wilson provides an accurate summing up of the essential differences between the plays:

There is a world of difference between the humane and humorous genius of Lindsay, with his wide sweep and genuine sympathy for the suffering poor, and the bitter doctrinaire spirit of Bale. We cannot imagine Bale sparing even a reformed Wantonness, Placebo, and Solace.⁵⁸

The action and characterization of Lindsay's play are not directed, as they are in Kynge Johan, at depicting a struggle to the death between high-minded Monarchy and villainously corrupt Papacy.

Like Lindsay, Bale portrays a play-king at a time when a woman was ruler. In its final version, the play concludes with a celebration of Elizabeth, "whych maye be a lyghte, to other princes all/ for the godly wayes, whome she doth dayly moue/ To hir liege people.." We have no way of knowing what role Imperial Majesty played in the original play, but in the late version he appears after Verity has castigated Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order to bring about the reform of the estates and the punishment of those (the allies of the pope) who have wronged the kingdom since the reign of King John. His reference to "our predecessours" (2274) means that he must be regarded as a human ruler, but the allusion earlier in the play to Henry VIII as "duke Iosue" (1102) rules out a precise identification with that monarch: it may be argued, too, that Bale would have given his reforming king Henry's name

if he had intended this kind of identification to be made. Pafford's suggestion that Imperial Majesty personifies Edward VI⁵⁹ is difficult to justify on historical grounds, and since it depends upon a mistaken interpretation of the allusion to Leland (2150-51),⁶⁰ there is no reason to take it seriously. Imperial Majesty is not to be identified definitely with either king, but rather "he is representative of the spirit which governed Henry VIII: he must not be identified with the King, who is only the historical medium through which he works; this is the basic concept which makes it possible for Bale to represent this character as male even at a time when a queen was on the throne."⁶¹ Addressing Elizabeth, Bale implies his hope that she, too, will be guided by the "male" spirit of reform manifested in the person and actions of her father.

I do not wish to suggest that one play had any influence upon the other, but the parallel involving the nature of the reforming kings should be clear. Like Bale, Lindsay draws a dramatic portrait of a king who sanctions reform, at a point in history when there was no male ruler in his land. In both plays, the purpose of this representation is to express a hope that the reforming energies of a king now deceased (for Lindsay, James V, for Bale, Henry VIII) will be manifested in the person of another ruler. Lindsay of course had less reason for optimism, but that does not diminish the force of the parallel.

The theories concerning the influence of Ane Satyre

on theme, characterization, and action in a number of English plays and fragments belonging to the second half of the sixteenth century have been reviewed by Hamer, and he concludes - with one exception, rightly - that there are no parallels sufficiently close to suggest the influence of Lindsay. William Bullein's allusion to Lindsay in A Dialogue Against the Feuer Pestilence (1564)⁶² demonstrates that Ane Satyre was known in the south before its publication in 1602, but the vogue in England for secular plays which advocated reform of various kinds is more likely to have been stimulated by "native" dramatists such as Skelton and Bale. There are, however, some scenes in the anonymous Catholic morality Respublica⁶³ which constitute the exception to the theory put forward by Ward and Hamer, that Lindsay's play had no discernible effect on English drama. Respublica celebrates through its character Nemesis, "the mooste highe goddesse of correccion" (1783), the accession of Mary in 1553, but like Ane Satyre it focusses on oppression and injustice rather than on doctrinal controversy. The central character of the play is the "commonwealth", Lady Respublica, who is sadly misled by a company of vices under the leadership of Avarice. There are two scenes which immediately recall the mock-christening episode in Ane Satyre, and the following scene in which Falset almost ruins the whole disguise plot by forgetting his new name when he is introduced to Humanitie. In the first act of Respublica, Avarice confides to his companions Adulation, Insolence, and Oppression his plan to ruin Respublica (sc.iii), and explains to them how they

can assist (sc.iv). It becomes clear that the plot has no chance of success unless all of them assume new names, and Oppression informs Avarice, "Thowe must newe christen vs" (377). Amidst considerable argument, Insolence is renamed Authority, while Adulation and Oppression become Honesty and Reformation: Avarice himself takes the name of Policy. Adulation, however, is slow of study, and he has to learn the new names by rote, syllable at a time (389-413).

Avarice's warnings,

And whan yowe are [in] your Robe, keape yt afore
close (429)

All folke wyll take yow, if theye piepe vnder youre
gowne,
for the veriest catif in Countrey or towne... (431-2)

suggests that as in Ane Satyre, the new names are accompanied by changes of clothing. When the cloaked vices come into the presence of Respublica and are introduced by Avarice, the doltish Adulation threatens to reveal all by speaking in propria persona (560-61), but Avarice, like Lindsay's stage-manager Flatterie, manages to retrieve the situation (562, 565). The combination of mock-christening and threatened revelation at the crucial moment when disguised Vice confronts naïve Virtue suggests that Lindsay rather than Skelton provided the model for the scene in Respublica, the comic spirit of which is reminiscent of the scene in Ane Satyre. The episode as it exists in Lindsay's play is elaborated and expanded, notably in the characterization of the chief vice, and it is in no sense a close imitation.

That Lindsay's play should have had such a slight

influence on English drama is not surprising, in view of the increasing vogue for plays which were comparatively short and suitable for indoor production. Charteris's claim that the Edinburgh performance of Ane Satyre lasted "fra ix houris afoir none, till vi houris at euin"⁶⁴ may not be accurate, but it could not be acted out in its entirety in under four hours. Any potential adaptor of Ane Satyre would have been intimidated not only by its length, but also by its demand for an outdoor setting on a scale which no English play after The Castle of Perseverance seems to require. The fact that Lindsay advocates reforms which were appropriate to Scotland in the 1540's and 1550's, but certainly not to a "reformed" England is possibly another reason for its being considered remote and perhaps irrelevant in an English context. (One recalls George Bannatyne's reason for recording only certain extracts from the play in 1568: the "grave mater pairof" is omitted "becaws the samyne abvse Is weill reformit in scotland praysit be god".)⁶⁵ It is difficult to imagine how any English dramatist before Shakespeare would have reacted to a play in which "high seriousness" and bawdy humour are so thoroughly intermixed. Rapid transitions of mood and language are as marked a feature of Lindsay's play as they are of so much Scottish poetry, and English conceptions of what constituted decorum, in drama as well as in poetry, seem to have been more rigid than those customarily adhered to in Scotland.

Chapter X

Conclusion: the two traditions.

Anglo-Scots literary relations during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries illustrate what are, from a chronological point of view, two fairly distinct kinds of influence. The first is the use to which poets put their knowledge of the poetry of a much earlier period. Henryson, Dunbar, and Douglas, to take the most notable Scots examples, are separated by at least seventy years from Chaucer. Lindsay's use of Skelton's Magnyfycence as a model for the first part of Ane Satyre illustrates the second kind of borrowing, the use which a poet from one part of "Albion iland" makes of a work by a contemporary or near-contemporary in the other. The Kingis Quair, at the other end of the period represented by this thesis, is another Scots example of this kind of assimilation: the poem was written during the lifetime of Lydgate, and incorporates an episode drawn from The Temple of Glas. The major examples of Scots influence upon English poetry, as illustrated by the poetry of Skelton and Surrey, also fall into this category.

The fact that Scots poets should have been influenced by English poetry of a much earlier period is not in itself very surprising: in the work of Chaucer and Lydgate they found a great variety of genres, techniques, and styles, and the ways of adapting and amplifying these must have seemed virtually limitless. I have already suggested that for the Scots makars of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries Chaucer's poetry had the special relevance of being an immensely various translatio of European poetry into a vernacular setting, and that it had the further

attraction of having been composed within a milieu similar in many ways to their own, one in which the demands of performance were continually felt by the poet. Although they found comparatively few "spoken" effects in the work of Lydgate, it was valuable to them - in particular, to Dunbar - for its distinctive experimentation with various kinds of rhetorical embellishment. As I have tried to show in the early chapters of this thesis, there is nothing backward-looking in the makar poetry which borrows from the English literature of the relatively distant past: Chaucer and Lydgate are reworked critically, and there is very little in their work which is narrowly derivative. The same spirit of critical independence marks the Scots borrowings from "recent" English literature: in poetry this is illustrated in The Kingis Quair, and in drama by Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis. The Scots poets did not hold a complete monopoly of the ability to borrow imaginatively. Skelton's use of the flyting form and of the techniques of Colkelbie Sow does not obscure his own peculiar shrillness of temper. Similarly, Surrey's translation of Virgil observes a gravity and decorum which are the poet's own, even though he draws heavily from Douglas.

Recognition that some works illustrate "earlier" influences than others is, clearly, of little use in the task of critical evaluation: it would be misguided to suggest, for example, that Lindsay's approach to Skelton's play is any different from Henryson's approach to The Nun's Priest's Tale, simply because Lindsay takes as his point

of departure the work of a recent English author. The fact that not all literary interchange in this period involves a time-lag of thirty years or more does, however, make it very clear that political tensions and the distance between Edinburgh and London did not prevent works written in one kingdom from becoming known to poets in the other within a few years of composition or publication. The constant diplomatic activity between the two capitals, and occasionally even the harsher political realities of imprisonment and exile, appear actually to have promoted cultural interchange. Some of the more interesting of these occasions, and the figures involved in them, have been mentioned in the preceding chapters - the enforced sojourn of James I at the English court and his marriage to an English noblewoman, the protracted diplomatic business prior to the marriage of James IV and Margaret Tudor and the marriage itself, the appointment of a shadowy "Scottishman" to the post of royal tutor in the household of Henry VII, the peregrinations of George Dundas, the exile of Gavin Douglas and later of his niece by marriage, the widow of James IV. It is incorrect to assume that it was necessary for a work, either English or Scots, to have appeared in print before it could become known in the other country. Lydgate's Isopes Fabules, for example, can have been known to Henryson only in manuscript form, and The Legend of Good Women (not published until 1532) must likewise have been available to Douglas only in manuscript. This too was the only way in which Skelton could have encountered Colkelbie Sow, and Surrey the Scots Aeneid

translation. The advent of printing must inevitably have made the transmission of texts from England to Scotland easier and more widespread, and in view of the late development of the technology in Scotland it is natural that the Scots should have obtained more from England in the way of printed material than the English obtained from them. After 1530, of course, a large amount of Scots poetry was published in London - the work of Henryson, Douglas, and Lindsay - but its immediate influence on English writing was negligible.

When there is such persuasive internal evidence that literary works, in either manuscript or print, found their way from one country to the other, it is reasonable to infer that knowledge by the Scots poets of recent literary developments in England, and by English poets of Scots work, was not so restricted as the amount of borrowing between near-contemporaries might suggest. The fact that Dunbar, Douglas, and Lindsay do not refer, either directly or indirectly, to the work of English authors such as Hawes, Barclay, Bradshaw, and Nevill need not imply that the English work was unknown to them. The tributes which the Scots pay to the Chaucer-Gower-Lydgate triumvirate, which are paralleled by similar expressions in post-Lydgatian English poetry, are in fact the only clue to the Scots' knowledge of southern writing. (The idea that silence need not imply ignorance is reinforced by Skelton's practice: the Tudor poet is completely silent about the course of his own country's poetry after the death of Lydgate.) Con-

versely, the failure of early sixteenth century poets to refer to Henryson, Dunbar, or Douglas must not be taken as an indication that they were unaware of the northern tradition. National loyalty is undoubtedly an important consideration: there would have been many writers on both sides of the border who would have agreed wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the author of The Complaynt of Scotlande (1549), that "there is nocht tua nations vnder the firmament that ar mair contrar and different fra vthirs nor is inglis men and scottis men, quhoubeit that thai be vitht in ane ile, and nychtbours, and of ane langage."¹

It is interesting to observe that his literary tastes extended to English compositions.² J.M. Berdan's theory about the total isolation of one body of national literature from the other has never been directly challenged. An example of its influence upon critical thinking is provided by Roberta Cornelius's remark that there is only the remotest possibility that William Nevill, the author of The Castell of Pleasure, may have read either The Pallice of Honour or King Hart.³ It is true, as she suggests, that the resemblances between The Castell and either of these poems are slight, but this does not rule out the possibility that Nevill (whose work had been published before 1518) may have known these and other Scots poems, but that he chose to follow other models - English ones. In the same way, it seems to me highly probable that the Scots poets of the early sixteenth century had read at least some of the productions of their English contemporaries, but that they elected to follow different models: the most important

of these are the poetry of Chaucer and Lydgate, and earlier Scots poetry.

The borrowings across national boundaries which take place after the late fifteenth century - those of Skelton, Surrey, and Lindsay - are remarkable not only for the different kinds of creative impulse which they reflect, but also because they cut across definite trends of literary development. The history of each national literature throughout the fifteenth and earlier sixteenth centuries exhibits a high degree of continuity: English poetry is conditioned by earlier English poetry, Scots poetry by what had been written in Scots, even though poets in southern England and lowland Scotland can have been by no means ignorant of one another's work. Unless this cohesiveness and continuity is properly understood, it is difficult to comprehend just how radical the borrowings discussed in the last three chapters are. The importance of internal literary influences on both English and Scottish poetry is itself a subject for a book-length study, and in the following pages I can do no more than indicate some of the more striking aspects of this internal continuity.

The pervasive sense of the poet's presence in his work is one of the most strongly Chaucerian features of Middle Scots poetry: like Chaucer, the Middle Scots poets wrote for the ear as well as for the eye, for an audience composed of both listeners and readers. This "performance" aspect of poetry remained important in Scotland at the same

time as it was in decline in England. Successive Stewart households were the main focus of patronage and literary activity - a great deal of the poetry discussed in the previous chapters refers either directly or indirectly to life at the royal court. There can be no suggestion of course that all Middle Scots poetry originated in the castles and palaces of Edinburgh, Stirling, and Linlithgow: the lesser courts of magnates such as the Dunbars, the Douglasses and the St. Clairs are also associated with the production of vernacular literature. Nor was the enjoyment of poetry confined to a small and privileged class of courtiers: Scotland had a literate middle class, and the enjoyment of poetry and song does not seem to have been confined to any particular social group. It seems reasonable to assume, however, that the enjoyment of all forms of literature throughout the social spectrum must have been encouraged by the poetry of the royal court. The Epistle to Lindsay's Dreme confirms the spoken quality of the verse itself in its suggestion that as late as 1528, non-lyric poetry was still written with the demands of performance in mind. Just as in the past the poet had entertained and amused the boy-king with his music and games, so now he devises a variety of stories for the recreation of the young man. Lindsay's "story of the new" (a miniature speculum principis) follows on naturally from the list of "antique storeis" (31-45), and there is the implication that like them, it is to be recounted by the poet himself in the presence of his master.

For the makars of the second half of the fifteenth century, Chaucer's poetry had the attraction not only of being related, in terms of its spoken quality, to their own literary milieu, but also of having become part of their own literary tradition at an earlier stage of the fifteenth century. Although Henryson, Dunbar, Douglas, and others had independent access to manuscripts and prints of Chaucer's work, they had in The Kingis Quair an important precedent for composing poetry in the Chaucerian mode. This statement raises, of course, the question of the extent to which the Quair was known in Scotland in the century after its composition. The absence of any allusion to the poem in specific terms should not be taken as an indication that it was unknown to the later makars. The manuscript in which the poem is preserved and attributed to the king was compiled no later than 1505, and it is extremely unlikely that the possession of a high-ranking nobleman could have remained unknown to contemporary poets: Henry Lord St. Clair, whose name and coat of arms appear in the MS as "neir coniunct in blude" to Gavin Douglas, who tells how he translated the Aeneid at his kinsman's request (Eneados I, Prol. 86-100). The poem was, however, almost certainly known to other poets before the compilation of the manuscript. MacQueen discusses the way in which Minerva's speech on free-will in the Quair is recalled, in terms both of word and idea, in The Preiching of the Swallow.⁴ It is also possible that Henryson's perspective on his subject matter in The Testament of Cresseid - that of an older man musing upon a story of youthful love - may have been

suggested by James's practice. Lancelot of the Laik, probably written during the reign of James III,⁵ offers evidence that the Quair was known to at least one of Henryson's contemporaries.⁶ The Prologue to the translation of the French prose romance is indebted to Chaucer, in particular to The Legend of Good Women, but there are also several verbal echoes of the Quair in both the Prologue and the translation itself. The most interesting of these are contained in Lancelot's two soliloquies, the first uttered during his imprisonment (698-717), the second after his release (1010-27). The first plays upon the plight of "double peine and wo" - the dual sorrow of physical bondage and imprisonment to love - which is shared by the narrator of the Quair and by the lovers of The Knight's Tale. Verbal parallels suggest indebtedness to James rather than to Chaucer: e.g., "Quhat haue y gilt, allace! or quhat deseruit" (697; cf. KQ st.26, 3), "Sen thelke tyme that I had sufficians" (708; cf. KQ st.16, 2). The theme of heavenly predestination from birth,

I curss the tyme of myne Natiuitee,
Whar in the heuen It ordinyd was for me,
In all my lyue neuer til haue ees.... (703-5)

seems also to have been taken from the Quair, where it is a recurring theme (sts. 1, 22, 146-7, 196). Lancelot's apostrophe to his heart in the second lyric,

Bot hart, sen at yow knawith she is here,
That of thi lyue and of thi deith is stere,
Now is thi time, now help thi self at neid.. (1018-20)

recalls both James's "Bot hert, quhere as the body may nought throu.." (st.63, 4) and the address to the nightingale, "Here is in fay the tyme and eke the space" (st.59, 2).

The Lancelot poet takes up another line from the nightingale passage, the poet's exasperated cry "Me think thow gynnys slepe" (st.57, 7), using it for the herald's reproach of Lancelot, "Awalk! It is no tyme to slep" (1048). The poem abounds in verbal reminiscences of the Quair, none of them in itself sufficiently long to prove indebtedness, but conclusive when considered in association with the others.

A parallel of a different kind is the use of the Chaucerian motif of a command given to the poet by the love deity. Lancelot is closer to the Quair than to Chaucer's Prologue, since the God of Love issues specific orders about the composition of short lyric forms. James is commissioned by Venus to encourage the spread of "The songis new, the fresch carolis and dance" (st.121, 2), and in the Quair itself there are several demonstrations of James's ability as a lyricist. This is the kind of poetry of which the God of Love, several decades later, has tired:

for thir sedulis and thir billis are
So generall, and ek so schort at lyte,
And swne of thaim is lost the appetit.. (142-4)

Possibly this was intended to remind his audience of the Quair, to indicate that James's hint to other court poets had been fulfilled to the extent that the love lyric had become a hackneyed form. The Lancelot poet, like James, uses the imagery of the flower to refer to an actual person. In the Quair Queen Joan is identified with the "gerafloure" - "And thus this floure.. So hertly has vnto my help attendit" (st.187, 5-7; st.190, 6). In Lancelot, the poet hints

strongly that the daisy or marguerite ("thar was the quene alphest")⁷ is the emblem of his mistress:

Thar was the garding with the flouris ourfret,
 Quhich is in posy fore my lady set,
 That hire Represent to me oft befor
 And thane also.. (71-4)

This is the basis of MacQueen's suggestion that the lady-queen is to be identified as Margaret, Queen of James III, or as the king's mistress, whom Bishop Leslie designated as "ane howir callit the Daesie".⁸ Even if a sound argument against historical identification could be advanced, it would be reasonable to assume a source for the flower conceit in The Kingis Quair. The attempt to write an anglicized form of Scots - evident, for example, in the use of "ith" for Scots "it" and "is" terminations, and of the prefixes "y" and "wh" for Scots "quh" - seems to be in imitation of the Quair rather than of Chaucer's poetry.

The various instances of indebtedness to the Quair make it highly probable that James I is the great poet whom the Lancelot poet refuses to name at the end of his Prologue:

Bot first I pray, and I besek also,
 One to the most compilour to support,
 Flour of poyetis, quhois nome I wil report
 To me nor to non vthir It accordit,
 In to our rymyng his name to be recordit;
 For sum suld deme It of presumpsioune,
 And ek our rymyng is al bot derysioune,
 Quhen that remembrith is his excellens,
 So hie abuf that stant in reuerans.
 Ye fresch enditing of his laiting tounge
 Out throuch yis world so wid is yroung,
 Of eloquens, and ek of retoryk,
 Nor is, nor was, nore neuer beith hyme lyk,
 This world gladith of his suet poetry.
 His saul I blyss conseruyt be for thy;
 And yf that ony lusty terme I wryt
 He haith the thonk yerof, & this endit. (318-34)

(Line 327 echoes James's praise of Boethius: st.7, 2.) If Chaucer (the next most likely contender) is intended here, it is difficult to understand the poet's reticence, given the fifteenth century vogue for acknowledging Chaucer's influence. But reluctance to name James I is easier to understand. If he were to invite comparison between his own work and that of a recent monarch, the charge of "presumpsioune" might easily be made. A similar kind of delicacy in the matter of claiming association with the royal poetic talent may perhaps explain the absence of James from Dunbar's roll call of poets in The Lament for the Makaris. This suggestion is just as valid as those advanced by McDiarmid:

That Dunbar .. makes no mention of him might be variously explained; it may simply illustrate the fact that kings are most naturally remembered as kings, or be due to a feeling that too much would have to be said if he were cited at all.⁹

Lancelot of the Laik offers the strongest evidence that the Quair was known to and appreciated by later Scots poets. To it and the reminiscences in Henryson must be added Lindsay's praise of James I as "Gem of Ingyne ... and flude of Eloquence" (Papyngo, 431-2). One is tempted to believe that The Kingis Quair was known to Alexander Scott: the most that can be said is that his lines,

Quha is perfyte to put in wryt
the inwart murnyng and mischance,
or to indite the grit delyte
of lustie lufis observance,
bot he that may certane patiently suffir pane
to win his soverane in recompance?¹⁰

recall the nature of James's special authority as a love poet.

The main contribution which the Quair makes to the naturalization of Chaucer into the Scots tradition is its demonstration of the value of interesting authorial presentation in first person poetry. Since I have paid considerable attention to the contribution which authorial self-depiction makes to the poetry of James, Henryson, Dunbar, and Douglas, I intend to show only how several uses of a particular Chaucerian technique illustrate borrowing by one Scots poet from another. Mention has already been made of the way in which the Lancelot of the Laik poet takes over the "poet's instruction" motif which James I adapts from the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women. In all three works, the dramatic device of the love-deity's command to write a certain kind of poem is a way of introducing a fictional "historical" dimension. The effect, as I have already suggested, is to foster a sense of personal intimacy between poet and audience: put very simply, it is as though the poets are allowing those about them into a confidence. The literary public of any age is interested in personal background (even when they are aware of poetic fiction), and the situation in which the poet is told what he is to write must have had a particular appeal to those familiar with the realities of patronage. The device is used in a more complicated way in The Palice of Honour, in Douglas's account of his allegiance to Venus. The love lyric "Vnwemmit wit deliuerit of dangair" and the promise to translate "ane buk" for Venus have a significance which goes beyond the development of the poet's "aventure". I suggest that Douglas is quite deliberately echoing the

"poet's command" sections of The Kingis Quair and Lancelot of the Laik, as well as Chaucer's Prologue. By so doing, he shows his audience that he is helping to sustain the life of the poetic genres recommended by his predecessors. The lyrics throughout the poem, and the surrounding frame of the first person allegorical narrative, are in the tradition of the Quair, while the task of translation is the supreme example of the creative activity which the God of Love's messenger recommends in Lancelot - the contribution of a long poem "Of love, or armys, or of sum othir thing". By appreciating the reference to earlier Scots poems as well as to Chaucer's poem, we are made aware of Douglas's claim for a place in a distinctively Scottish tradition. (This claim is of course also advanced in other ways.) Use of the "poet's instruction" device does not stop with The Palice of Honour. The dialogue between the poet and reproachful May in The Thrissil and the Rois is another interesting development. As I have suggested in Chapter VI, Dunbar's professed reluctance to write in praise of love is a way of qualifying the celebratory effect of what follows. The result is reminiscent of Chaucer's manner in The Parlement of Foules, but the command motif itself has probably been adapted from The Palice of Honour, which had been completed in 1501.

Henryson's Prologue to The Lion and the Mouse and Douglas's thirteenth Eneados Prologue are related to the first person passages discussed above in that they are dramatic vignettes which introduce poems through the fiction

that compulsion has been brought to bear upon the teller. Henryson tells how he dreamt that a richly dressed man, bearing the implements of a writer, came to greet him in the wood. The poet acknowledges him as "maister", and asks who he is. His delight when the stranger replies, "Esope I hecht, my writing and my werk/ Is couth and kend to mony cunning Clerk (1375-6), is a felicitous personal touch, since of course the Scots poet is one of those cunning clerks. Aesop agrees only reluctantly to the other poet's request that he should tell "ane prettie Fabill", because he feels that if "haly preiching" falls on deaf ears there can be no point in using poetic fiction for the purposes of correction. At the conclusion of the fable itself, the younger poet presses him to provide explication:

Quod I, "Maister, is thair ane Moralitye
In this Fabill?" "Yea, sone," he said, "richt gude."
"I pray yow, Schir" quod I, "ye wald conclude."
(1570-72)

The use of this kind of first person framework, reverted to in the last stanza of the moralitas, gives a special prominence to this fable. Unlike the others, The Lion and the Mouse purports to be the actual words of Aesop. The framework also enables comment about the worth of different kinds of rhetorical utterance to be made: i.e., that "haly preiching" should be a more effective means of persuasion than the poetic fable. As MacQueen suggests, Aesop's aesthetic judgement is probably a way of drawing attention to The Preiching of the Swallow.¹¹ It is difficult to identify the source (if indeed there is one) of Henryson's poet-dialogue. The idea may well have been suggested by Lydgate's

The Fall of Princes or its Latin original, in which a procession of famous figures - some of them poets - come to tell their stories to the recording poet. These passages are, however, "dialogues" in only the most general sense, and it is clear that in spirit Henryson's Prologue is closer to the Scots "instruction" passages discussed above. Like them, it serves the dual function of providing both background and comment about the value of a particular kind of literary endeavour.

The Prologue to Book XIII of the Eneados is closely modelled on Henryson. (It is hardly necessary to argue that Douglas is a more creative imitator than Richard Smith.) Like the earlier poet, Douglas records how he wandered alone through the flowering landscape, falling asleep under a tree (a "greyn lawrer" rather than a hawthorn). He, too, is approached by an old man, whom he identifies as a fellow-poet: the description of the headdress - "Lyke to sum poet of the ald fasson" (88) - echoes Henryson's line, "His Bonat round, and off the auld fassoun" (1353). The newcomer is Virgil's fifteenth century continuator Mapheus Vegius, who comes to rebuke Douglas for his failure to translate "The thretteyn buke ekit Eneadan". When the younger poet gives his reasons for the omission Mapheus sets upon him:

"Thou salt deir by that evir thou Virgill knew."
 And, with that word, doun of the sete me drew,
 Syne to me with hys club he maid a braid,
 And twenty rowtis apoun my riggyng laid,
 Quhill, "Deo, Deo, mercy," dyd I cry,
 And, be my rycht hand strekit vp inhy,
 Hecht to translait his buke....

(145-51)

The spectacle of brute force overcoming the poet's moral and artistic scruples is of course richly entertaining, and it has no counterpart in Henryson's encounter with the much more courteous Aesop. But Douglas follows Henryson in exploiting the situation of a dialogue between poets to suggest a difference between two kinds of writing: not, as in the Fabillis, the difference between sermon and poetic fable, but between two approaches to classical poetry. One is the exact and sensitive approach of the faithful translator of Virgil, the other is the interpretative approach taken by a continuator. The dialogue mirrors Douglas's doubt concerning the propriety of appending a "schort Christyn wark" to his translation of the Aeneid, and at the same time it emphasizes in a very diverting manner the fundamental difference between Book XIII and the remainder of the translation. By protesting that he was forced into submission, Douglas provides a skilful and witty defence against criticism for the inclusion of a spurious book.

All of these passages about the writing of poetry illustrate a prevailing concern for the human and dramatic. Poetry is felt to be a spoken art, and for this reason the presence of the speaker is evoked with as much immediacy as possible. Henryson, Dunbar, and Douglas acquired some of their first person techniques from Chaucer, but in adapting the English poetry they had a precedent in The Kingis Quair. The value which is placed upon human drama helps to give a new vigour and interest to their handling of various well-

worn medieval genres, especially to their handling of various kinds of allegory. Pearsall's definition of the characteristic temper of fifteenth century poetry - "Moral earnestness, love of platitude and generalisation, a sober preoccupation with moral and ethical issues (often combined with a taste for the extravagantly picturesque and decorative)"¹² - applies to a great deal of Scots as well as to English poetry, but there is the important difference that the Scots makars make their presence felt in their moralizing, in their self-characterizations, and in the movement of their verse. The influence of Lydgate was not felt so strongly in Scotland as it was in England: Chaucer was more useful than Lydgate to poets who worked within a tradition of performance. Lydgate's poetry forms a literary watershed between Scotland and England, and the fact that it was imitated so extensively in the south but not in the north helps to explain why the work of Hawes and Barclay is so different from that of Henryson and Douglas. Nearly all of Lydgate's poetry is anonymous in tone, irrespective of whether or not it is written within a first person framework, and this impersonality is the poet's most important legacy to later English writing. The view that Lydgate is the pattern of a new orthodoxy of literary taste, "though as symptom rather than cause",¹³ demands some qualification. Lydgate helped to mould the taste for the sober and the explicit, and it would be difficult to overestimate his influence on later English poetry.

The Lydgatian influence can be gauged in various ways,

and in relation to various genres. My concern here is to illustrate that continuity of conception about the nature of poetry which is exhibited in the development of allegorical poetry in England. Lydgate's chief contribution is made not through love-allegory, but rather through those poems which explore a wide variety of ethical and religious themes, using the framework of a first person journey of discovery. In poems such as Reson and Sensuallyte and The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man, for example, Lydgate represents himself as a generalized humanitas figure engaged in a quest for knowledge. There are occasions when his voice catches the rhythm of speech (as occasionally within the dialogue between the poet and Venus in Reson and Sensuallyte, 2117-700), but in general no attempt is made to generate any kind of interaction between the first person frame and the scheme of narrative allegory which is developed within it. The poet's concern is with the amplification and explication of his subject matter, and any commentary on it is of an abstract and sententious kind. There is the barest minimum of individuating detail in Lydgate's self-characterizations (as a lover as well as the student of life), and an absence of irony and humour.

The pervasiveness of the abstract, generalizing, and heavily explicit style of poetic allegory in fifteenth century England has been a major obstacle to critics who have attempted to define the Lydgate canon. MacCracken excludes from it works such as The Assembly of Gods and The Court of Sapience, even though there are several

sixteenth century attributions of these to Lydgate. The arguments for and against his authorship have tended to centre upon metre, compared with that of works which are generally accepted as "genuine".¹⁴ Metrically, The Assembly of Gods is often hopelessly confused, whereas The Court of Sapience is usually regular. The vices of the one and the virtues of the other have their respective precedents in Lydgate's poetry. Within the compass of a single poem such as The Temple of Glas it is possible to find smooth and competent lines beside lines which it is difficult to scan at all, and if metre is to be used as a touchstone there seems to be no good reason why the two poems should not be given to Lydgate. If the Assembly and the Court are not by Lydgate, they are from the pen of an avid disciple. Both echo the encyclopaedic allegorical approach and the plodding explicitness of the "translations", The Pilgrimage and Reson and Sensuallyte. Like the echt-Lydgatia, they are written in the form of a series of static allegorical scenes. The overall theme of the Assembly is the apparent irreconcilability of Reason and Sensuality, which is amplified in turn by a lengthy "parliament of gods" scene, a psychomachia (the battle between the hosts of Vice and Virtue), a pictorial representation of the History of Man, and a concluding debate in which Reason and Sensuality resolve their differences in a common fear of Death. The elements of the Court are equally varied: a theological debate among the Four Daughters of God (which recalls Chapters XI-XIV of The Life of Our Lady), a miniature lapidary, an account of the Cardinal Virtues and the seven "Sciences

liberall", and several allegorized descriptive passages. These two poems, like Reson and Sensuallyte and the monumental Pilgrimage, must be conceded the merit of comprehensiveness: their "doctryne" is presented through an extraordinary variety of figurative schemes. What makes them so different from The Palice of Honour, which is equally comprehensive, is their failure to make any dramatic capital out of the grundmotif of the poet's journey. When the "I" addresses his audience directly, it is in a serious and wholly impersonal voice. The moralizing is worthy, but unvarying in its tone, and there is no attempt at even rudimentary characterization within the framework of the reported action. This implies the lack of any sense of direct contact between poet and audience, and uncertainty about the reader's powers of comprehension accounts in some measure for the explicitness of approach. At the end of The Assembly of Gods, the figure of Doctrine provides an exhaustive moralitas which explains the allegorical significance of almost every detail of the preceding narrative. This is a different kind of explicitness from that which marks the nymph's sermon in Douglas's poem, since here the audience is invited to observe for themselves how the various stages of the poet's journey are related to the unifying theme of Honour.

The Lydgatian combination of explicitness and comprehensiveness in the handling of allegory is carried on in the work of Stephen Hawes, which convincingly bears out the sincerity of its author's repeated claims to be considered

as the humble disciple of Lydgate: e.g.,

To folowe the trace and all the parfytenesse
Of my mayster Lydgate with due exercyse
Suche fayned tales I do fynde and deuyse. (PP 47-9)

The narrative scheme of Hawes's most ambitious work, The Passetyme of Pleasure,¹⁵ is original in that it fuses the "life of man" allegorical scheme with the framework of the chivalric quest. In style, subject matter, and tone, The Passetyme is related to The Court of Sapience, which Hawes attributes to Lydgate (PP, 1356-8). Hawes's most notable borrowing is the expansion of the section which deals with the getting of Sapience through dedicated application to the liberal arts and other kinds of learning (CS, sts.221-328). Over one-fifth of the Passetyme is devoted to telling of Graunde Amoure's successive visits to the chambers of Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric, Arithmetic, Music, Geometry and Astronomy in the Tower of Doctrine. The poem goes on to tell of the narrator's wooing of the lady La Belle Pucelle, which takes him on a journey to the Tower of Chivalry. Before attaining the lady's favour he is called upon to slay two allegorical giants, one with three heads, the other with seven: obligingly, the monsters provide their own instant expositions, written on banners attached to their heads. Hawes's flaccid structural scheme has room not only for monsters and companies of graceful female personifications, but also for Old Age, Death, Eternity, and the Nine Worthies. The long poem is devoid of the continuity which might have been achieved by some "humanizing" of its central character, and in the absence of this Hawes is forced to resort to explaining what is to come and to making pocket

summaries of what has gone before. Mead observes with justified asperity that "the reader is repeatedly confronted with a twice-told tale."¹⁶

In his defence of poetry in the section on Rhetoric, invention is defined as the process of,

Clokyng a trouthe with colour tenebrous
For often vnder a fayre fayned fable
A trouthe appereth gretely profytable. (712-14)

(The definition is reminiscent of the theory announced in the Prologue of the Morall Fabillis: although there is no trace of a Henrysonian influence on Hawes, it is possible that the Fabillis were known to him.) The Passetyme and shorter poems such as The Example of Vertu and The Conforte of Louers¹⁷ illustrate that Hawes followed his own precept by consistently amplifying his subject matter in the manner approved by literary tradition:

For to inuencyon it is equypolent
The mater founde ryght well to comprehende
In suche a space as it is conuenient
For properly it doth euer pretende
Of all the purpose the length to extende
So estymacyon maye ryght well conclude
The parfyte nombre of euery symylytude. (743-9)

This view of poetry, as well as being pertinent to Hawes's own work, is a commentary on the Lydgatian tradition to which it belongs: the highest form of literary art is that which cloaks an edifying morality in the guise of a protracted personification allegory. The tradition is carried on in shorter poems such as The Castell of Labour¹⁸ and Nevill's The Castell of Pleasure: the first of these (which is possibly the work of Alexander Barclay) uses the dream vision framework and personification allegory to exalt

the spiritual value of work, while the second seems indebted to the chivalric strain of The Passetyme and The Conforte of Louers. There are verbal parallels and similarities of narrative detail between The Castell of Pleasure and Hawes's work, but even more conclusive is the heavily sententious and totally impersonal manner in which Nevill, like Hawes, treats an allegory of love. Barclay's major contributions to the genre of the long allegorical poem, The Ship of Fools¹⁹ and the Eclogues,²⁰ represent departures from the usual "cloudy figures" of allegory: the translation of Brant's Narrenschiff is cast in the form of a long series of sermons, while the Eclogues use dialogue to develop their "sentence". Although there are lively and entertaining passages in both poems, the prevailing technique is one of repetitious and anonymous sermonizing. The poet who weaves into The Ship of Fools a eulogy of James IV, and who is said by Bullein to have been born "beyonde the cold river of Twede",²¹ may have been born a Scot, but there can be no doubt that he learned his poetic craft south of the border.

The continuity of fifteenth and early sixteenth century poetry in England which is reflected in the continuing respect for non-personal, non-dramatic allegorical forms can be illustrated in various other ways. With the exaltation of moral improvement as the raison d'être of poetry comes a distrust of humorous effects in serious poetry. Again, Lydgate is important both as direct influence on later poets and as an arbiter of the kind of taste for

which they wrote. The way in which Lydgate praises Chaucer's achievement in the Prologue to The Fall of Princes (274-357) and in the Prologue to The Siege of Thebes (18-57) leaves little doubt that his response to Chaucer was wider than modern criticism has usually been prepared to allow,²² but at the same time it is clear that Lydgate found it very difficult to imitate Chaucer's lightness of touch in his own work - at least in his longer poems. In the Prologue to The Siege of Thebes Lydgate struggles to follow the humorous drama which centres on the directness of the Host in The Canterbury Tales, but the effect is crude and clumsy. Calling upon Lydgate for a tale, the Host, who will hear of "non holynesse", requests "somme thyng that draweth to effekke/ Only of Ioye" (167-71). It is understandable that the poet should begin "with a pale cheere", for the comic mode is foreign to his talent. This is not to suggest that Lydgate's political history is dull: Pearsall rightly commends it for its "deep moral concern, good sense, and a sober solemnity of style."²³ It is clear that Lydgate felt that there was something profoundly improper about humorous effects in a serious poem. Perhaps the monastic temperament is partly responsible for this, but the reason for the sober uniformity of tone is more likely to be the poet's sense that the distance between himself and his readers called for a stricter sense of decorum in the matter of tone than Chaucer had found it necessary to observe in the company of his courtly audience.

In The Passetyme of Pleasure, Hawes launches an attack

on contemporary poets who disdain to follow his master's example:

They fayne no fables pleasaunt and couerte
But spend theyr tyme in vaynfull vanyte
Makyng balades of feruent amyte
As gestes and tryfles without fruytfulness.. (1389-92)

The complaint is carefully general, but it is tempting to see a reference to the poet who dared to suggest that Lydgate's style was "to haute", and who drew upon a whole battery of "vyle termes" as well as upon the sober language of the Lydgate tradition. The vehement attack in Barclay's Fourth Eclogue on poets who are,

 auoyde of honestie,
Nothing seasoned with spice of grauitie,
Auoyde of pleasure, auoyde of eloquence,
With many wordes, and fruitlesse of sentence, (699-702)

with its gibe at the "Poete laureate" in the service of "stinking Thais" (685-6), is quite clearly a reference to Skelton's departures from respectable models of poetic eloquence. The poet-shepherd Minalcas takes upon himself the task of reforming the young shepherd's tastes, which run to "merry fits" about the delights of the ale-house (719-26), through his own "ballade extract of sapience" (759-90). At the end of The Ship of Fools, Barclay defies his audience even more openly to prefer Skeltonic newfangledness to his own elevated productions:

Wyse men loue vertue wylde people wantones
It longeth nat to my scyence nor cunnyng
For Phylp the Sparowe the Dirige to synge.

Barclay's references to Skelton indicate a satiric talent of sorts, which reveals itself occasionally throughout The Ship of Fools: the portrait of the foolish book-

owner who boasts, "I am content on the fayre couerynge to loke" (sts. 23-35) is the most memorable of these passages. In spite of his fondness for sustained pedantic moralizing, Barclay must be given credit for a humorous sensibility which is rare in English poetry of that period. When a note of comedy is sounded in the longer works of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, the effect is usually one of incongruous vulgarity. Mention has already been made of the schoolboy jesting which precedes Lydgate's sober history of the siege of Thebes, and it is indicative of the tonal continuity within post-Lydgatian English poetry that this kind of comic effect is not uncommon. The "low" comedy of the Godfrey Gobelive episodes in The Passeytyme, for example, might have been effective in a separate poem, but in context it is incongruous even as light relief. A similar startling juxtaposition of the sententious and the bawdy can be found in the later sixteenth century "folly" works in the tradition of The Ship of Fools, Robert Copland's Jyl of Braintford's Testament and The Hye Way to the Spyttel Hous.²⁴ The sparseness of any subtle humorous effects comparable with the gradations of irony and satire in the poetry of Henryson and Dunbar is symptomatic of the strength of Lydgate's precept.

The topics of authorial presence, tonal variety, and variation of language and metre are inextricably linked. That continuity within the English tradition which I have attempted to illustrate can also be seen in the language and versification of most of the poetry of this period.

What is most remarkable about the language of most fifteenth and early sixteenth century poetry is its gravity and uniformity of level. The subject requires much fuller discussion than I am able to provide here, but in general it should be evident that successive English poets followed Lydgate's example in striving for refinement of English poetic diction. Hawes praises Lydgate for his use of Latin:

From whens my master Lydgate deryfyde
 The depured rethoryke in Englyshe language
 To make our tongue so clerely purifyed
 That the vyle termes shoulde nothyng arage
 As lyke a pye to chattrre in a cage
 But for to speke with Rethoryke formally
 In the good ordre withouten vylany. (PP, 1163-9)

It is not difficult to understand why the tribute should have been made. The refinement of language to which borrowing from Latin contributes, and the organization of words into elegant formal patterns may produce an effect which is impressive in its gravity and uniformity of tone - one thinks immediately of Lydgate's poems of religious celebration. But Lydgate's verse also illustrates the danger of separating a "depured" rhetorical style from the vocabulary and rhythms of a spoken language. His longer poems show an avoidance of any kind of colloquial usage: the only variation from the sober and measured middle style is in the direction of heightening, and in a poem of any length the inevitable result is tonal monotony. Lydgate's metre is usually deficient not in being confused, but rather in being insufficiently varied. The Kingis Quair illustrates a sustained use of a vocabulary which is neither insistently colloquial nor elaborately formal, but it avoids the monotony of The Temple of Glas because of the author's Chaucerian

feeling for spoken effects. For Hawes, Barclay, and a host of other English poets, Lydgate's vocabulary and versification were influential models. Most post-Lydgatian poetry fails to reproduce even the measured solemnity of the master's eloquence. The work of Lydgate's followers shows a widening of the gulf between literary and spoken language, and one suspects that to Hawes at least the use of any kind of colloquial effect of diction or rhythm in a non-satirical context would have been as deplorable as the use of "vyle termes". Barclay's poetic vocabulary is more varied and less abstract, but his sense of rhythm is equally deficient. The mere fact that the subject matter of his two long poems is linked to an objectively real world is no guarantee against monotony. The metrical incompetence which negates any attempt to enliven poetry through variation of language, cannot be explained adequately by theories about the instability of the spoken language and the decline of inflections.²⁵ A more convincing explanation is to be found in the breaking of the old link between poetry and performance which removed the obligation upon poets to control their rhythms. This factor is also relevant to the syntactic confusion which is common in post-Lydgatian verse: convoluted arrangement of words is not such an obstacle to the reader as it is to the listener.

The interest in refinement of language and sobriety of tone is accompanied by the elevation of amplification to the position of a guiding principle in poetic composition. The control which Chaucer exercises over his subject matter

is demonstrated by variations in vocabulary, tone, and rhythm: later poets seem to have ignored this kind of control in their pursuit of an ideal of "prolixitee". We see this in the endless moralizing, the interminable allegorical figures, the sustained use of a restricted level of poetic language, disordered metre and syntax, and in a failure to observe discipline in the use of certain rhetorical effects. Hawes's lines on Measure (PP 2591-604, 2619-39), for example, show an absurdly extravagant use of anaphora: the separation between style and subject matter is of course a wholly unintentional irony. Although most of Skelton's poetry is radically different from the work of his contemporaries, its strident lack of control makes it very much part of the English tradition. I refer particularly to the sustained rhymes of poems such as Colyn Cloute and Elynour Rummyng, the fondness for prolonged parallelism, and that pervasive disregard of structure which gives his work its curiously "open-ended" effect. As C.S. Lewis remarks, "There is no building in his work, no planning, no reason why any piece should stop just where it does."²⁶ It is important to remember that the Scottish works which feature effects of this kind have a comic and burlesque character. His "helter-skelter" lines are something entirely new in English poetry, but the lack of discipline which they embody is one of the strongest features of the poetry against which they react.

It may be objected that this brief account of the continuity apparent within the longer poems of fifteenth

and early sixteenth century England is too selective: i.e. that it fails to take into account poems which do not share the features outlined above. There are, for example, those erotic allegories which sixteenth century editors attributed to Chaucer - works such as The Flower and the Leaf, The Assembly of Ladies, The Cuckoo and the Nightingale, and The Court of Love - which display a lightness of touch, a feeling for structure and rhythm, which are absent from the other allegories of the period. Their value and interest, like the merits of The Complaint of the Black Knight and The Temple of Glas, cannot be denied, but at the same time it is important to recognize that this kind of writing is by no means characteristic of the period. The first three poems mentioned above were almost certainly written before 1475,²⁷ and Skeat convincingly places The Court of Love, on linguistic grounds, after 1532. Skeat makes the interesting suggestion that this poem is indebted to Scottish poetry, in particular to The Kingis Quair. It is, however, highly unlikely that such a link exists, for what may appear to be verbal parallels between the two amount to no more than independent borrowing from the courtly poetry of Chaucer and Lydgate. Like James, the English poet draws upon the hall of Venus episode in The Temple of Glas (CL, 218-66): at every point, The Court is closer to its English antecedent than to The Kingis Quair. Skeat comments on the "smoothness of rhythm and the frequent modernness of form, quite different from the halting lines of Lydgate and Hawes", suggesting that "the author may have learnt his metre from Scottish authors, such as Henryson and Dunbar".²⁸

Although he probably did know some Scots poetry, the model for his versification is more likely to have been Lydgate at his best in the courtly pieces. The use of aureate words such as "celsitude" and "pulcritude" need not point to borrowing from Scots, as Skeat claims: it seems just as likely that these words were taken from Hawes (PP 80) or from one of the other English poets interested in extending the range of Lydgate's Latinate vocabulary.

The continuity which is apparent within the Scots literary tradition is just as strong as the continuity within English poetry of what Hammond calls "the transitional period", but it is of a totally different character. I have drawn attention throughout this study to the strong sense of authorial presence in Scots verse. Even without the evidence provided by a series of different uses of a particular first person technique such as the one discussed earlier in this chapter, the strength of the sense of "voice" in Scots poetry would be the mark of a continuity which is just as remarkable as the widespread anonymity of contemporary English poetry. The cohesiveness of the Scots tradition is not to be illustrated by reference to a series of long and sober allegorical exercises. Although there is no reason why The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man and later The Passetyme of Pleasure should not have been read in Scotland, it is clear that there was no attempt made by poets to imitate their prosaic long-windedness. The continuity of the allegorical mode in Scotland is a matter of its very diversity. Warton was right to praise the makars for

"their striking specimens of allegorical invention, a species of composition for some time almost totally extinguished in England."²⁹ "Invention" is the key word here. The Kingis Quair illustrates the adaptation from Chaucerian and Lydgatian sources of a new kind of allegory, based on an identifiable personal vie humaine. Henryson's contribution is a non-explicit species of allegory: non-explicit, in the sense that his moralitates frequently appear to contradict the literal and emotional logic of his "feneit fabillis", thereby making demands on the intellectual capacity of his audience. In The Testament of Cresseid, there is no overt interpretation of the episode in which the planetary deities confer to decide the heroine's fate: the grouping of the figures, and their individual attributes, provide the key to the allegorical significance of the episode. Henryson's brevity and understatement are in marked contrast with the technique of The Assembly of Gods. The scene in which the court of gods confers about the punishment of Eolus serves the same allegorical function as the scene in the Testament - highlighting the inevitability of natural law - but it is considerably longer, and is followed by a wholly unnecessary "explanation" by Doctrine (1625-729). Dunbar works within shorter allegorical forms, but a poem such as The Goldyn Targe indicates that he shared Henryson's confidence in the power of his audience to extract the full weight of meaning without authorial prompting. As a translator who realizes that he has no warrant to "moralize" Virgil in the body of his text, Douglas frequently reminds his audience that the task of

detailed interpretation is for them to undertake: e.g.,

Reid, reid agane, this volume, mair than twyss:
 Consider quhat hyd sentence tharin lyis;
 Be war to lak, less than ze knew weil quhat;
 And gif zou list not wirk eftir the wiss,
 Heich on your hede set vp the foly hat. (VI, Prol.
 12-16)

Douglas's predecessors seem to have shared his confidence in the actual ability of their audience to seek out and to find their "hyd sentence".

The Palice of Honour, inasmuch as it employs the framework of a poet's journey in search of knowledge, belongs to the same general category of vision allegory as The Passetyme of Pleasure, but there is a wide gulf between the two. Where Hawes is painstakingly explicit at every turn of his narrative, Douglas constructs his poem so that the audience is able to infer the relation between each of its parts, with passages of explicit moralizing being worked into the dramatic framework. King Hart is also related to The Passetyme in that it is a "life of man" allegory. In mood and technique, however, it is quite different. There is a bare minimum of description and an absence of authorial commentary: its appeal stems from a combination of stylized dramatic effect and rapid narrative pace. The affinities of King Hart are with other Scots "brief allegories" such as The Goldyn Targe and Bewty and the Prisoneir. Like them, it is a vigorously told psychomachia, and the closeness of the relationship is indicated by the echo of Dunbar's terse account of the blinding of Reason (GT, 203-4) in the description of Discretioun's fate (KH, 281-5).

Although the fifteenth century in England saw the composition of a great many religious and secular lyrics (some of which are of a very high standard), the longer forms of poetry predominate. Scottish literature has its share of long poems, but with the obvious exceptions of the historical romances and the Eneados, there is no poetic work with the sprawling dimensions of The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man, The Passetyme, and The Ship of Fools. The willingness shown by successive poets to experiment with shorter forms is one mark of the versatility of the Scots tradition as compared with the English. Dunbar's experimentation with a wide variety of genres is the most striking example of this, but his range is by no means exceptional. There is good reason to doubt Henryson's authorship of all of the shorter poems attributed to him,³⁰ but even so his output is even more varied than the use of several kinds of allegorical narrative suggests. If Douglas had written only The Palice of Honour and the Eneados, the contrast between the two styles of composition, discursive allegory and accurate translation, is great enough to leave no doubts about his adaptability: the variety of the Eneados Prologues, most of them self-contained short poems, will be discussed separately below. It is very likely that James I provided a precedent for later court poets in the variety of his own writing. Even if Peblis to the Play is not the work of James, recognition must be given to Major's account of the variety of the king's writing in the vernacular.³¹ An integral part of the court literary tradition in Scotland is the assimilation of strongly comic matter which English

taste would no doubt have dismissed as being "vyle" or "upland", and hence offensive to a cultivated audience. The poem about a farcical tournament between low-life characters has a firm place in the Scots tradition. Pebelis to the Play is related to other works by court poets - The Sowtar and Tailyouris War, Lindsay's The Iusting betuix Watsoun and Barbour, and Scott's Justing and Debait. The fourteenth century English Turnement of Tottenham,³² which may be the ancestor of all of the Scots pieces, differs from them in having no associations with courts and court poets. The popularity of this comic genre among "serious" poets is a reminder that the distinction between courtly and popular taste in Scotland is not always an easy one to make.

I have mentioned several aspects of the traditionalism of Middle Scots poetry - the strong sense of authorial presence and control, inventiveness in allegorical composition, and within the output of individual poets, a high degree of variety in subject matter and tone. All are features of Chaucer's work, and the Scots court poetry discussed in this thesis may be described as "Chaucerian" inasmuch as it shows a respect for the standards of Chaucer's poetry. For James, Henryson, Douglas, and Dunbar, Chaucer is valued as both a standard of excellence and a source of matter and style. The Scots verse is also Chaucerian in its synthetic and selective approach to the literary past: the only difference is that the Scots were able to draw upon an even wider variety of source material. For the

northern makars of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries the Scots tradition, as it had been developed by earlier poets and by contemporaries, reinforced the values taught them by Chaucer's poetry. Another aspect of their tradition is a feeling for richness of verbal texture: the attention shown to detail at the level of the individual line is in marked contrast to the diffuseness of most contemporary English poetry. The difference becomes apparent when (for example) the introductory stanzas of The Example of Vertu and The Goldyn Targe are compared. Each passage is a development of the Lydgatian style of aureate description. Hawes's lines are syntactically and metrically haphazard,³³ and their polysyllabic terminations strengthen the effect of ponderous circumlocution:

Whan the golden sterres clere were splendent
 In the firmament purifyed clere as crystall
 By imperyall course without incombremment
 As Iuppyter and Mars that be celestyall.. (36-9)

Dunbar uses an even more elaborate style of aureate description, creating an evocative tension between imported polysyllabic diction and native monosyllables in the line "Up sprang the goldyn candill matutyne". This tension between the aureate and the familiar is the key to the choice of diction in the stanzas which follow, and the effect is to give an impression of the abundant life contained within the overall harmony of Nature. The idea is reinforced by alliteration, and by the carefully controlled rhythms: variation from the iambic norm of the ten-syllable line is made to intensify the sense of rapid movement. In Chapter VI I suggested that the juxtaposition of Scots words

against the Latinate coinings is part of an attempt to outdo the verbal brilliance of Lydgate's aureate effects. It is possible that the idea of intensifying the alliterative element in the English passages of nature description came to Dunbar from the Prologue to The Lion and the Mouse. Henryson's lines show how evocative the combination of alliteration with a relatively simple vocabulary can be. The Scots tradition of experimentation with this descriptive convention is also illustrated by The Palice of Honour and Douglas's twelfth Eneados Prologue. The conclusion to the latter shows quite clearly that Douglas set out to surpass all that had been written before in a similar vein:

The lusty crafty preambill, "perle of May"
 I the entitel, crownyt quhil domysday,
 And al with gold, in syng of stait ryall
 Most beyn illumnyt thy letteris capital.

The twelfth Prologue is a triumphant affirmation of the resources of the poet's "Scottis", and of his place in a developing literary tradition. (This traditional significance is overlooked by Penelope Starkey in her recent discussion of this passage: she observes merely that it is "a final grand flourish before the translator settles down to complete his great task".)³⁴ Douglas borrows from his own poem "maid weil twelf zheris tofor", and from The Goldyn Targe and The Thrissil and the Rois: the indebtedness can be traced to the level of word and image, but it is more important to observe that Douglas amplifies the various elements which contribute to the rich verbal texture of his models. There is development and extension of the two

"extremes" of Dunbar's vocabulary, the aureate and the familiar, as part of a more detailed and more extensive descriptio. In each of his poems Dunbar devotes a stanza to describing the rising of the sun (GT 1-9, TR 50-56): in Eneados XII, a similar description occupies some forty lines. Douglas's use of Scots words to balance his aureation in the account of the sun is even more remarkable than Dunbar's:
e.g.,

Defundand from his sege etheryall
Glaid influent aspectis celicall;
Befor hys regale hie magnificens
Mysty vapour vpspryngand, sweit as sens,
In smoky sop pys of donk dewis wak,
Moich hailsum stovys ourheldand the slak. (41-6)

The transition from aureate to simple is made without any deflation of tone: the continuity is provided by the rhythmic sweep of the lines and by the use of alliteration. Into the idealized literary landscapes of the two Dunbar poems and The Palice are introduced homely and familiar details. The cock may indeed be "Phebus red fowle" (155), but he is a cock for all that, and like the grandiloquent roosters of the Morall Fabillis he is glimpsed scratching for his food "Amyd the wortis and the rutys gent" (155-8). The presence of lowly creatures such as the cock, the gasping corby and the "cowschet" in the company of the more poetic grades of "Dame Naturis menstrualis" illustrates the poet's concern for variety of subject matter. This is also apparent in his treatment of the human figures in the scene: as well as the singing nymphs and the sorrowful lovers of courtly tradition, there is a pair of roisterers who whisper of some "schamefull play" (187-224). The variety of subject

matter is complemented by variety of style. In language, a heightened form of polite speech is enlivened by variations to the aureate mode, to the "busteous" manner of some traditional alliterative poetry, and to simple colloquialism. There is also tonal variation within the overall celebratory mode: note, for example, the contrast between the two types of dramatic utterance, the vaguely sinister human dialogue, and the harmonious sermocinatio of the birds which follows it (213-24, 252-66). Douglas's praise of Virgil for his range and versatility - "He altyrris his style sa mony way ... Lyke as he had of euery thyng a feill" (V, Prol. 33-8) - quite justifiably invites comparison with his own achievement.

The other Eneados Prologues, like the twelfth, serve both to introduce the translation and to provide authorial commentary on the subject matter and the poet's attitude as translator. At another level, the Prologues are a remarkable tribute to the strength and continuity of the Scots poetic tradition, and to the flexibility of "Scottis" as a medium for all kinds of poetic discourse. There is more variety in these prologues - of subject matter, genre, style, and language - than there is in the whole corpus of fifteenth and early sixteenth century English poetry, and considered together, they affirm both the inventiveness of the poet and the value of inspiration from other Scots poetry. Even the most uniformly "elevait" of them, the second and the tenth, preserve the illusion of spoken address from poet to audience. In the second Prologue he moves from the

grandly formal mode appropriate to an invocation to the "auld fader of malancoly" into a simpler homiletic style, singling out various sections of his audience. (This kind of direct address, which occurs in several of the Prologues, recalls the manner of some of Henryson's moralitates.) The first few stanzas of Douglas's meditation on the Trinity (Bk. X) provide even stronger evidence of Henryson's influence: the theme of apprehending the Creator through the Creation is explored in the first thirteen stanzas of The Preiching of the Swallow, and the tonal similarity between the two passages is immediately obvious. The sense of the poet's presence in his work which is fostered by rhythm and direct appeal to his audience is strengthened in other prologues by Douglas's self-revelations. Earlier in this chapter his use of Henryson's Prologue to The Lion and the Mouse was discussed: the inspiration of Henryson's self-portrayal in The Testament is apparent in the Prologue to Book VII, where the poet tells of his attempts to dispel "the peralus persand cald". That willingness to discuss the background to the writing of poetry - whether it be real or fictional - is, as I have tried to show elsewhere, one of the most significant features of the interest in the personal and the dramatic which is so pervasive in Scots poetry.

The eighth Prologue puts a complaint about the times into a dramatic setting, through the medium of the alliterative line and the traditional alliterative stanza form. Two quite separate forms of Scots poetry are brought together here. The subject matter of the poem, the degeneracy

at work within all levels of society, is also that of several poems by Dunbar: the similarity is enhanced by the use of the "Sum .. sum" construction which is featured in Tydingis fra the Sessioun, and by the alliterating vernacular vocabulary. The stanza form is basically the same as that of alliterative romances such as Golagros and Gawayne and The Awntyrs of Arthure. Douglas's choice of style is both a way of giving fresh interest to the well-known general complaint theme and of showing that the old alliterative metre and vocabulary are worthy of a place in a developing literary tradition. In England alliteration came to be regarded as having a purely ornamental value, as a device to be used occasionally for emphasis. No poet who claimed to use the literary language of Chaucer and Lydgate would have deigned to use the old provincial style of "rum, ram, ruf".

Thorough investigation of the links which exist between Douglas's Prologues and earlier Scots poetry is beyond the scope of this study, and I have tried merely to give some idea of the extent to which Douglas's writing is inspired and supported by the work of Henryson, Dunbar, and poets whose names have not survived. The sense of belonging to a local community of poets, it is reasonable to infer, helped to sustain Douglas in his herculean task of rendering Virgil into his "lewit barbour tong". It is significant that both Prologues and translation contain very few verbal reminiscences of either Chaucer or Lydgate: the poetry of Henryson and Dunbar, written in his own

language, has a much more immediate relevance. It is not to be wondered at, then, that there is no sign of influence from contemporary English poetry which is of scarcely greater merit than Caxton's "buke of Inglyss gross". The work of "venerabill Chauser, principal poet but peir" undoubtedly played some part in developing Douglas's literary taste, but the work of other Scots poets, "Chaucerian" or otherwise, is a more important influence on the Eneados. Like his predecessors, Douglas is highly selective about what English work he chooses to adapt for his own "making" - more is taken from Chaucer than from Lydgate, and nothing at all from the post-Lydgatians.

Because it shows so very few signs of having been influenced directly by English verse, the poetry of Lindsay has not been discussed in detail in this study. His poetry, to an even greater extent than Douglas's, affirms the strong continuity of the Scots tradition. In his tribute to the literary past in The Testament of the Papyngo, "Chawceir, Goweir, and Lidgate laureate" are the first to be mentioned, but there is no suggestion that their work is regarded as superior to that of the Scots poets: having praised their example, he goes on to lament the loss of a much larger company of Scots makars. As I have already suggested, his tribute to the "Byschope of Dunkell" leaves no doubt about where his strongest allegiance lies. Lindsay's position in the Scots literary tradition is analogous to Hawes's position in the English tradition, and the difference between the poets whom they single out as models

of "ingyne" and "eloquence" is a mark of the gulf which separates the two national traditions of poetry. The influence of Douglas and several of the other poets named in The Testament of the Papyngo is everywhere apparent in the language and rhetorical techniques of Lindsay's work, and in the illusion of spoken eloquence which all of it (with the exception of The Buke of the Monarche) creates. Like his predecessors, Lindsay borrows to enhance the individuality of his own talent. His use of Skelton's Magnyfycence illustrates the same high order of selectivity which governs the use to which earlier poets put the poetry of Chaucer and Lydgate. Skelton's play suggests a certain form and certain dramatic techniques, but these are adapted to complement the needs of Lindsay's own theme. It is hardly necessary to add that the language of Ane Satyre owes nothing to Skelton: it is assertively Scots, immensely various in its range, the product of an interplay between an individual creative talent and its spoken and literary heritage.

At the beginning of this chapter I suggested that the infrequency with which both English and Scots poets from the late fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth century draw upon each other's work need not imply total ignorance of the other literary tradition. Given the sheer dullness of most English poetry of the period, it is not difficult to understand why the Scots tended to ignore it as they did. It is natural, though, to wonder why the wide-ranging excellence of Scots poetry seems to have stimulated no poets other

than Skelton, Wyatt and Surrey. There is no single satisfactory answer, but the very weight of Lydgate's example as a writer of uniformly sober didactic poems is part of the reason for the ossification of English poetry. The growing interest in the standardization of language - both spoken and literary - is a related factor. The Lydgatians would have found it difficult to comprehend, much less to imitate, the breadth and range of Scots poetic vocabulary. In the Poems Against Garnesche Skelton strenuously exploits the colloquial vocabulary at his disposal, yet he fails to match the abusive profuseness of The Flyting. The relative poverty of English may account, at least as much as the wish to write an elegantly concise translation of Virgil, for Surrey's failure to echo any more of Douglas's vocabulary than he does.

In Barclay's fourth Eclogue, Minalcas explains that the continued life of poetry depends upon the interest of princes:

Than standeth the Poet and his poeme arere,
When princes disdayne them for to reade or here. (655-6)

Barclay and Hawes, like Lydgate, make claims upon the attention of their monarchs, and it is clear that they hoped that their "hye stile of eloquence" would be read at court. But it is difficult to find, even in the much more topical and outspoken poetry of Skelton and in the work of the Henrician courtier-poets, any equivalent to the sense of easy and intimate address from poet to prince which is so strongly present in Scots poetry. (Wyatt's epistolatory

satires, addressed to friends and fellow courtiers, are exceptional among contemporary English writing, in the sense which they convey of a spoken communication between poet and audience.) The Scots frequently complain of neglect at the royal hands, but the subject matter and tone of much of their work suggests strongly that as poets they enjoyed a freedom of expression which no Lancastrian or Tudor monarch would have suffered. The fact that they wrote for the edification and amusement of a small court for whom the hearing of poetry was at least as important as the reading of it may have limited the appeal of their work to poets who occupied a peripheral place in the life of a larger and more complex court. Anthony à Wood writes of how Henry VII would listen to Hawes reciting from memory passages of Lydgate.³⁵ If there is any truth in the account, it is a remarkable tribute both to the poet's powers of memory and to the king's powers of concentration. It is not difficult to see how an English poet writing for such sober royal tastes might have been appalled by a Scots poet's freedom of expression.

The sense of being part of a community of writers, present and past, courtly and non-courtly, is still persistent among Lindsay's contemporaries and successors. Even as late as the turn of the century, William Fowler is able to elaborate a theme taken from The Testament of Cresseid. In the work of earlier poets who, unlike Fowler, were still writing in Scots, there are many tributes, both explicit and implicit, to an interest in older Scots poetry. William

Stewart, for example, borrows heavily from Dunbar. In the Prologue to The Seven Sages, John Rolland tells how he sought the advice of four famous court poets - Lindsay, John Bellenden, William Stewart, and Bishop Durie - about how to compose a new poem. The result, The Court of Venus,³⁶ abounds in reminiscences of poems by Henryson, Douglas, Dunbar, and Lindsay, but in its ponderous handling of the structural convention of the journey and in the mechanical approach to love-allegory, the poem is closer to The Court of Love. Rolland, like the sixteenth century imitator of The Temple of Glas, is writing in a self-consciously archaic way, and it must be acknowledged that the English poem is more graceful and more witty. Although there is much in later Scots poetry that is genuinely new and inventive, there is a marked decline from the high standards of the early sixteenth century. One of the marks of this decline is the prolixity of poems such as The Court of Venus and The Cherrie and the Slae. It is difficult to avoid the suspicion that later poets began to look back for inspiration, not only to Scots poetry, but also to the English literature which their predecessors had chosen to ignore. Another sign of this turning to southern poetry, as Jack points out,³⁷ is the appearance of features of Lydgatian versification in the work of Stewart, Fowler, and Alexander Craig.

The Essayes of a Prentise shows a strong concern for continued experimentation in the art of vernacular poetry: although James was by no means ignorant of older vernacular

forms and techniques (the flyting, alliteration), his tastes were European rather than Scots, and it is natural that he should have looked to French and Italian poetry as the inspiration of new literary forms in Scots. By the time the king's treatise had been written, English poetry had begun to undergo a renaissance which eclipsed the literary revival at the Scots court, and it is inevitable that his removal to London should have hastened the decline of Scots poetry which had begun before his reign in Scotland. The nature of the shaping influence of politics upon poetry at the beginning and end of the Middle Scots court tradition is a fascinating accident of literary history. Political circumstance - in the shape of incarceration at the English court - provided the unlikely occasion for a Stewart king's apprenticeship to English poetry, an apprenticeship which was to have far-reaching consequences for the poetry of his own country. 180 years after the return of James I to Scotland, his descendant, another poet-king, travelled south to claim the throne of England, thereby hastening the demise of a literary tradition which had been nourished by the political "infortune" of the first James.

Appendix I

The Nightingale and the Cuckoo: Literary
Reminiscence in The Kingis Quair.

Scottish Literary Journal II, i (1975), 70-71.

Recent editors and critics of The Kingis Quair¹ have underestimated the significance of the imprisoned lover's appeal to the Nightingale. Unable to communicate with the lady below in the garden, the prisoner implores the Nightingale to sing a song of love that she will be able to hear:

O lytill wrecche, allace, maist thou nought se
 Quho commyth zond? Is it now tyme to wring?
 Quhat sory thought is fallin vpon the?
 Opyn thy throte. Hastow no lest to sing? (57. 1-4)

The plea concludes with the challenge that if the Nightingale refuses to sing:

Quhat, wostow than sum bird may cum and stryve
 In song with the, the maistry to purchase?
 Suld thou then cesse? It were grete schame, allace.
 And here, to wyn gree happily for euer.
 Here is the tyme to syng, or ellis neuer! (59. 3-7)

McDiarmid sees the narrator's mood in this scene as one of "anxiety lest the hope glimpsed in the girl should vanish".²

Jean Robert Simon also regards the scene as a way of depicting the prisoner's disturbed emotional state.³ John Norton-Smith is rather patronizing about the episode, failing to see in it even a persuasive representation of feeling:

"James's unique attractiveness may be summed up in his indulgent concern about the nightingale's failure to sing, and in his seriousness and irrelevant search for the reason."⁴

It should be recognized that the prisoner is anxious not only because the sleeping Nightingale is his only source of communication with the lady, but also because of the possibility that another bird will arrive. The "sum bird", unidentified in the Quair, is almost certainly the Cuckoo, whose song is feared by lovers. In Clanvowe's poem, The Cuckoo

and the Nightingale (The Book of Cupid),⁵ the narrator tells how, among lovers,

it was a commune tale,
That it were good to here the nightingale
Rather than the lewde cukkow singe. (48-50)

When he (a lover himself) hears the Cuckoo's song, he calls out to the Nightingale, in a manner that it reminiscent of the narrator in the Quair:

"A! goode Nightingale!" quod I thenne,
"A litel hast thou been to longe henne;
For here hath been the lewede Cukkow,
And songen songes rather than hast thou". (101-4)

The song of the Cuckoo, as the bird dialogue makes clear, is a song in condemnation of love,⁶ and the narrator's anxious hope that the Nightingale should have "maistry" is very much like the reaction of the prisoner in the Quair.

James clearly intended that his audience, by recalling The Cuckoo and the Nightingale, should understand that the prisoner is afraid that the Cuckoo will sing first because this would mean bad fortune for his love-suit. The allusion to Clanvowe's poem, like James's adaptations of sections of The Knight's Tale and Troilus and Criseyde, is a subtle and very effective way of enriching the "sentence" of the Quair.

Notes

1. Quotations are from M.P. McDiarmid, ed., The Kingis Quair of James Stewart (London, 1973).
2. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 64.
3. Le Livre du Roi (Paris, 1967), 171-2.
4. James I of Scotland: The Kingis Quair (Oxford, 1971), xv.
5. W. Skeat, ed., Chaucerian and Other Pieces, XVIII.
6. Lydgate stresses the antipathy of the birds in As A Mydsomer Rose, 25-6.

Appendix II

Notes

Chapter I

1. Early Tudor Poetry (New York, 1920), 416-17.
2. "The Scottish Alliterative Poems", PBA XXVIII (1942), 221.
3. See M. A. Mackay, The Alliterative Tradition in Middle Scots Verse (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1975), 83-137.
4. The Northern Arthur: a study of two alliterative Arthurian romances in their literary and historical context (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1975).
5. The Poems of King James VI of Scotland, ed. J. Craigie (2 vols., STS, 1955-8), I, 81.
6. Kurt Wittig makes the point that alliteration may be not wholly a "one way influence from English", in that there may be a degree of influence from Gaelic poetry: The Scottish Tradition in Literature (Edinburgh and London, 1958), 108-9.
7. See R. L. Graeme Ritchie's Introduction to his edition of The Buik of Alexander (4 vols., STS, 1925-9), I, xxx-lxi.
8. The French Background of Middle Scots Literature (Edinburgh, 1934). Hereafter Smith, The French Background.
9. The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun, ed. F. J. Amours (6 vols., STS, 1903-14), I, Prologue 115-16.
10. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama (Oxford, 1954), 84.
11. ABC of Reading (London, 1951), 118.
12. R. D. S. Jack, The Italian Influence on Scottish Literature (Edinburgh, 1970), 9-14, 15-16.
13. The Bannatyne Manuscript, ed. W. Tod Ritchie (4 vols., STS, 1927-32), III, No. CCIII, 22-4.
14. Smith, The French Background, xxi.
15. For a full description of MS Selden B.24, see E. P. Hammond, Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual (1908, repr. New York, 1933), 342-3.
16. See Matthew P. McDiarmid, ed., The Kingis Quair of James Stewart (London, 1973), Introduction, 6-7. All quotations follow this edition. Hereafter McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair.

17. W. Beattie, The Chepman and Myllar Prints: A Facsimile with a Bibliographical Note (Edinburgh, 1950), 109-35.
18. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. CXXIII, 199-201.
19. The Maitland Folio MS., ed. W. A. Craigie (2 vols., STS, 1927), I, No. IV, 195-6.
20. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. CXXIV, 201-2. Cf. the Ellesmere MS. text of the poem, which contains an extra stanza: H. N. MacCracken, ed., The Minor Poems of John Lydgate (2 vols., EETS ES 107, OS 192), II, No. 18. All quotations from Lydgate's minor poems follow this edition. Hereafter MacCracken, The Minor Poems.
21. The Bannatyne MS., III, No. CCLXXXIII, 304-5. See also John MacQueen, ed., Ballattis of Luve (Edinburgh, 1970), xvii-xviii, 3-4. Hereafter Ballattis of Luve.
22. The Bannatyne MS., IV, No. CCCLXXI, 82-7.
23. The Bannatyne MS., III, No. CCLVII, 270-72. See also Ballattis of Luve, xviii, 5-6.
24. The Bannatyne MS., II, Nos. XXI, XLIX, 50, 105-8.
25. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. LXXXVIII, 178-80.
26. G. Stevenson, ed., Pieces from the Makculloch and the Gray MSS. (STS, 1918), Nos. X, XIV.
27. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. LIII, 113-15; IV, Nos. CCCXLI (23), CCCXLIII (23), CCCXLIX (34-5), CCCL (35-6), CCCLXI (49-64), CCCLXII (64-70), CCCLXXI (82-7).
28. The Works, 1532 (Scolar Press facs., Ilkley, 1969), fo. CCCXIb.
29. J. A. W. Bennett, ed., Devotional Pieces in Verse and Prose (STS, 1955), 270-74. Hereafter, Devotional Pieces.
30. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. II, 2: cf. Carleton Brown, ed., Religious Lyrics of the XV Century (Oxford, 1939), No. 56.
31. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. CXXVII, 206-8: cf. Religious Lyrics of the XV Century, No. 183.
32. Devotional Pieces, 64-169. See also Introduction, v-vii.
33. Cited by Denton Fox, ed., Testament of Cresseid (London and Edinburgh, 1968), Introduction, 6-7. Hereafter Fox, Testament.

34. J. Durkan and A. Ross, comps., Early Scottish Libraries (Glasgow, 1961), 7.
35. Ethel Seaton, "That Scotch Copy of Chaucer", JEGP XLVII (1948), 352-6.
36. J. Gairdner, ed., The Paston Letters, A.D. 1422-1509 (6 vols., London, 1904), III, 47.
37. D. F. C. Coldwell, ed., Virgil's Aeneid translated into Scottish Verse by Gavin Douglas (4 vols., STS, 1957-64), II, 14-15. Quotations follow this edition.
38. Ballattis of Luve, xxviii-xxx.
39. Ballattis of Luve, xxxvi. See also John MacQueen, "Some Aspects of the Early Renaissance in Scotland", Forum for Modern Language Studies III (1967), 219-20, and below, 330-31.
40. J. T. T. Brown, ed., The Quare of Jelusy (STS Miscellany Volume, 1933).
41. M. M. Grey, ed., Lancelot of the Laik (STS, 1912).
42. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 31.
43. All quotations from Henryson, unless otherwise indicated, follow H. Harvey Wood, ed., The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson (2nd edn., Edinburgh and London, 1958).
44. Robert Henryson: A Study of the Major Narrative Poems (Oxford, 1967), 55. Hereafter MacQueen, Henryson.
45. See below, 138ff.
46. All quotations from Dunbar, unless otherwise indicated, follow W. Mackay Mackenzie, ed., The Poems of William Dunbar (1932; repr. London, 1970).
47. See Caroline F. Spurgeon, ed., 500 Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, I, 1357-1800 (London, 1914), 14-43. Hereafter, Spurgeon.
48. Spurgeon, 46-8.
49. Ed. A. Erdmann and E. Ekwall (EETS ES 108, 125, 1911, 1920), ll. 40-57.
50. Spurgeon, 19.
51. Priscilla Bawcutt, ed., The Shorter Poems of Gavin Douglas (STS, 1967). All quotations, unless otherwise indicated, follow Mrs. Bawcutt's transcript of the Edinburgh edition (1579).

52. Douglas Hamer, ed., The Works of Sir David Lindsay of the Mount, 1490-1555 (4 vols., STS, 1931-6), I. All quotations from Lindsay follow this edition. Hereafter Hamer, The Works.
53. "The Scottish Chaucerians", in Chaucer and Chaucerians: Critical Studies in Middle English Literature, ed. D. S. Brewer (London, 1966), 170. Hereafter, "The Scottish Chaucerians".
54. Ed., King James I of Scotland: The Kingis Quair (Oxford, 1971), Introduction, xiii. Hereafter Norton-Smith, The Kingis Quair.
55. Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period (London, 1959), 24.
56. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 187.
57. For more detailed accounts of Middle Scots poetic language, see M. A. Mackay, "The Scots of the Makars", in Lowland Scots: papers presented to an Edinburgh conference (Edinburgh, 1973), 20-30; A. J. Aitken, "Variation and variety in written Middle Scots", in Edinburgh Studies in English and Scots, ed. A. J. Aitken, et al. (London, 1971), 177-209. Both articles provide essential qualifications to the view of G. Gregory Smith, that Middle Scots is an "artificial, created and literary language": Specimens of Middle Scots (Edinburgh and London, 1902), xi-xii.
58. Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century (Oxford, 1947), 1-11.
59. H. J. Chaytor suggests that even as late as the end of the fourteenth century, such accomplished silent readers were comparatively rare: From Script to Print (London, 1945), 17. See also Ruth Crosby, "Chaucer and the Custom of Oral Delivery", Speculum XLIII (1938), 413-32.
60. All quotations from Chaucer follow F. N. Robinson, ed., The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer (2nd edn., London, 1957).
61. Reproduced as the frontispiece of P. M. Kean's Chaucer and the Making of English Poetry (2 vols., London, 1972).
62. "The earlier poems", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, 40.
63. John Lydgate: A Study in the Culture of the XVth Century, tr. A. Keep (London, 1961), 35.
64. "The English Chaucerians", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, 201.
65. Durkan and Ross, Early Scottish Libraries, 136.

66. "The English Chaucerians", 206.
67. W. Mackay Mackenzie, ed., The Bruce (London, 1909), Bk. I, 4-5.
68. W. Goodall, ed., Scotichronicon Joannis de Fordun cum supplementis et continuatione Walteri Boweri (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1759), Bk. XVI, c. xxx.
69. J. Constable, ed. and tr., A History of Greater Britain (Edinburgh, 1892), 366.
70. The History and Chronicles of Scotland, ed. Aeneas J. G. Mackay (2 vols., STS, 1899), I, 163.
71. Hamer, The Works, IV, 188-93.
72. For a discussion of literacy in Scotland in this period, see John Durkan, "Education in the Century of the Reformation", in Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513-1625, ed. David McRoberts (Glasgow, 1962), 145-68.
73. John Lydgate (London, 1970), 9. Hereafter Pearsall, Lydgate.
74. "The Scottish Chaucerians", in The Cambridge History of English Literature, ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller (Cambridge, 1908), II, 239.

Chapter II

1. I do not intend to discuss the question of authorship. The view that the Quair may not have been written by James I, put by J. T. T. Brown (The Kingis Quair: A New Criticism: Glasgow, 1896), A. Lawson (ed. The Kingis Quair and The Quare of Jelusy: London, 1910), and W. M. Mackenzie (ed. The Kingis Quair: London, 1939), is convincingly countered by McDiarmid. He argues that the language is consonant with a date of composition in the first half of the fifteenth century, and that the historical details given accord with what is known of James's capture and captivity (McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, Introduction 28-33, 38-42). Equally important are the two ascriptions to James in the MS, and Major's testimony (46-8).
2. E. M. W. Balfour-Melville, James I, King of Scots (London, 1936), 266.
3. Balfour-Melville, 168n., 255-6.
4. Balfour-Melville, 66, 92-3, 191, 205.
5. Balfour-Melville, 31.
6. Details about the history of the lords of St. Clair are provided by J. A. Sinclair, "The Lordship of Sinclair", SNQ XI, vii (1898), 97-8.
7. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 60.
8. Scotichronicon, Bk. XVI, c. xxx.
9. Norton-Smith, The Kingis Quair, Introduction, xxi.
10. Balfour-Melville, 80-81.
11. Balfour-Melville, 60.
12. Balfour-Melville, 51, 57.
13. Balfour-Melville, 83.
14. Balfour-Melville, 81, 87.
15. Epistle to "The Shepheardes Calender", in Spenser: Poetical Works, ed. J. C. Smith and E. de Selincourt (London, 1912), 416.
16. Ed., The Kingis Quair (STS, 1911), Introduction, xxiv.
17. "The Language of the 'Kingis Quair'", Essays and Studies XXV (1939), 30.
18. "The English Chaucerians", 227. Pearsall goes so far as to suggest that the attribution to James stems from "an excess of zeal on the part of the Scottish scribes".

19. Norton-Smith, The Kingis Quair, xxix.
20. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 164.
21. I prefer the MS reading "my sentence" to McDiarmid's emendation "the sentence".
22. Balfour-Melville, 251.
23. "Chaucer's Influence upon King James I of Scotland as Poet", Anglia III (1880), 223-65. Hereafter, Wood.
24. W. Scheps, "Chaucerian Synthesis: The Art of 'The Kingis Quair'", SSL VIII, iii (1971), 160.
25. Wood, 226.
26. "Chaucer the Pilgrim", PMLA LXIX (1954), 928-36.
27. Criticism and Medieval Poetry (rev. edn., London, 1972), 87-138.
28. 'Piers Plowman': An Essay in Criticism (London, 1962): see also G. Kane, The Autobiographical Fallacy in Chaucer and Langland Studies (London, 1965).
29. In his textual commentary, J. R. Simon (Le Livre du Roi: Paris, 1967) suggests that there is a parallel to be drawn with the bell which Chaucer uses as a concluding device in The Book of the Duchess (208).
30. John Preston notes merely that James's use of the reading device as an introduction is the product of literary convention: "'Fortunys Exiltree': A Study of 'The Kingis Quair'", RES NS VII (1956), 341. The motif does, however, seem to have been originated by Chaucer: see M. W. Stearns, "Chaucer Mentions a Book", MLN LVII (1942), 28-31.
31. In Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts, tr. J. B. Kopp and J. J. Murphy (Berkeley and London, 1971).
32. "Tradition and the Interpretation of the 'Kingis Quair'", RES NS XII (1961), 120.
33. G. C. Macaulay, ed., The English Works of John Gower, I (EETS ES 81).
34. See Skeat, The Kingis Quair, 96: Wood, 257: Norton-Smith, The Kingis Quair, 81: McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 138.
35. See Robinson, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, 814, note to l. 15.

36. Scheeps suggests that the description of the lover's state in terms of contraries shows indebtedness to Chaucer, citing several passages from Troilus and Criseyde: "Chaucerian Synthesis", 162-4. While James's immediate model may have been Chaucer, the treatment is commonplace.
37. The poem, and the question of Lydgate's authorship, are discussed by Pearsall (John Lydgate, 97-103), and it has been edited by Skeat (Chaucerian and other Pieces: Oxford, 1987, 266-74). It is worth mentioning the possibility The Flower of Courtesy may have been influenced by the Quair, rather than the Quair by the Flower. There is no external evidence of the date at which the English poem was composed - there are no manuscripts, and it first appears in Thynne's 1532 edition of Chaucer. Because it so closely resembles The Complaint of the Black Knight and The Temple of Glas in language, style, and subject matter, the poem has been estimated to belong to the period pre-1420 (Pearsall, John Lydgate, 84). The evidence is at best inconclusive, and although it seems more likely that James should have reworked the English poem, the indebtedness may be in the other direction.
38. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 64n.
39. Norton-Smith, The Kingis Quair, xvii.
40. The phrase is borrowed from The Parlement of Foules, 89, where it refers to the narrator's state of mind before the dream.
41. The image of love as a game of chess is borrowed from The Book of the Duchess, where Fortune is adversary rather than benefactress: 618-19, 652-64. See also Lawson, lxi-lxii.
42. The MS. gives no warrant for McDiarmid's peculiar spelling, "excercise".
43. Ed. E. V. Gordon (Oxford, 1953).
44. See G. Kane, 'Piers Plowman': The Evidence for Authorship (London, 1965), Ch. IV.
45. W. Skeat, ed., Langland's Vision of Piers the Plowman: Text C (EETS OS 54), Passus XVIII, 124.
46. It is interesting to see a twentieth century novelist complaining that readers have lost the ability to see the public, universal value of characters modelled from life: "How is it that no one ever sees himself in the public mirror - in official Fiction?... Everybody gazes into the public mirror. No one sees himself!" (Wyndham Lewis, The Apes of God: London, 1931, 255).

47. The Allegory of Love (Oxford, 1936), 237. See also Mackenzie, The Kingis Quair, 26-7, 38: Wittig, The Scottish Tradition, 34: James Kinsley, "The Mediaeval Makars", in Scottish Poetry: A Critical Survey (London, 1955), 12.
48. The Allegory of Love, 236.
49. "The Structure of 'The Kingis Quair'", Research Studies of the State College of Washington XXV (1957), 276.
50. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 49.
51. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 55.
52. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 53.
53. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 54.
54. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 54, 139.
55. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 139. Chaucer, on the other hand, does use "yok" to refer to marriage: CT E 113 (Clerk's Tale), E 1285, 1837 (Merchant's Tale).
56. Skeat, Chaucerian and other Pieces, 347-58.
57. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 54.
58. See Robinson, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, 775, note to ll. 445ff.
59. Balfour-Melville, 248.
60. The Allegory of Love, 236-7.
61. Wood, 247.
62. J. Schick, ed., The Temple of Glas (EETS ES 60, 1891). Quotations follow this edition.
63. Pearsall, Lydgate, 106.
64. Historical fact is also relevant here. Even if the poem were written immediately after the marriage and the return to Scotland in 1425, James cannot have been younger than thirty.
65. "Tradition and the Interpretation of the 'Kingis Quair'", 122-4.
66. "Tradition and the Interpretation of the 'Kingis Quair'", 123.
67. Ed. F.J. Furnivall and K. B. Locock (EETS ES 77, 83, 92, 1899-1904).

68. "Tradition and the Interpretation of the 'Kingis Quair'", 126-30.
69. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 36-8.
70. "Tradition and the Interpretation of the 'Kingis Quair'", 126-7.
71. "Tradition and the Interpretation of the 'Kingis Quair'", 126-7.
72. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 72.
73. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 72.
74. See my note, "The Nightingale and the Cuckoo: Literary Reminiscence in 'The Kingis Quair'", SLJ II, i (1975), 70-71. [Appendix I]
75. Skeat notes that the arrival of the two birds in the same month was proverbial (Chaucerian and other Pieces, 526).
76. Norton-Smith, The Kingis Quair, xv.
77. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 64. See also Simon, Le Livre du Roi, 172.
78. Spurgeon, 130.

Chapter III

1. The Works, 1532, fo. CCXIXa.
2. Skeat is kinder to Thynne, pointing out the ambiguity of his title, "The Works of Geffray Chaucer newly printed, with dyuers works whiche were neuer in print before" (Chaucerian and other Pieces, ix). See Fox's comments in the Introduction to his edition of the Testament, 18, which argue against Skeat's view.
3. See above, 57-60.
4. Fox, Testament, 21-2.
5. J. A. W. Bennett argues that Henryson could not have assumed a good knowledge of Troilus and Criseyde on the part of his audience. If this is the case, it is impossible to explain why Henryson should have made what Professor Bennett admits is a "subtle and discriminating" use of motifs from Chaucer's poem: "Henryson's 'Testament': a flawed masterpiece", SLJ I, i (1974), 5.
6. Fox, Testament, 23. C. W. Jentoft gives a good account of Henryson's treatment of Chaucer's characters, and his point that the Scots poet makes Calchas the equivalent of Chaucer's Pandarus is especially interesting: "Henryson as Authentic 'Chaucerian': Narrator, Character, and Courtly Love in 'The Testament of Cresseid'", SSL X, ii (1972), 96-8.
7. Fox, Testament, 56.
8. MacQueen, Henryson, 60-61.
9. Bennett, "Henryson's 'Testament'", 14.
10. Kean, Chaucer and the Making of English Poetry, I, 148.
11. For a fuller discussion, see Kean, I, 155-62.
12. Chaucer's position is not far removed from that of Thomas Aquinas, who explains that there can never be perfect caritas in this life because "it is impossible always actually to think upon God, and be drawn toward him by voluntary love... a man may strive to keep himself free for God and things divine, laying other matters aside, save as life's need requires". Cited by H. O. Taylor, The Medieval Mind (2 vols., 4th edn., Cambridge, Mass., 1962), II, 507.
13. MacQueen, Henryson, 70. See also M. W. Stearns, "The Planet Portraits of Robert Henryson", PMLA LIX (1944), 911-27.

14. Dolores L. Noll, "'The Testament of Cresseid': Are Christian Interpretations Valid?" SSL IX, i (1971), 16-25. See also Jentoft, "Henryson as Authentic 'Chaucerian'", 100-101.
15. Five Poems, 1470-1870 (London, 1948), 16.
16. MacQueen, Henryson, 62.
17. Fox, Testament, 23-8.
18. Criticism and Medieval Poetry, "Conciseness and 'The Testament of Cresseid'", 180.
19. It is hard to see what is threatening to humanity about Jupiter's brand and spear, since Henryson lays stress on his protective function, and harder still to see why the "Doctour in phisick" line in the description of Mercury should be regarded as ironical: Spearing, 179.
20. Spearing, 187.
21. "Henryson's 'Testament of Cresseid'", Essays in Criticism XI (1961), 129. See also I. W. A. Jamieson, "'To preue thare preching be a poesye': some thoughts on Henryson's poetics", Parergon VIII (1974), 33.
22. "'The Testament of Cresseid' and 'The Book of Troylus'", Litera VI (1959), 18-24.
23. Cited by J. W. Blench, Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries (Oxford, 1964), 234.
24. MacQueen, Henryson, 88-93. The allegorical interpretation is rejected by Spearing (186-7, n.35), on the inadequate grounds that if Henryson had intended this to be done, he would have inserted an explicit moralitas.
25. See above, 98.
26. Fox, Testament, 56.
27. See, for example, T. F. Henderson, Scottish Vernacular Literature (3rd edn., Edinburgh, 1970), 124; Kinsley, Scottish Poetry: A Critical Survey, 21.
28. See MacQueen, "The case for early Scottish literature", in Edinburgh Studies in English and Scots, ed. Aitken, 240.
29. Howard Rollin Patch, The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval Literature (New York, 1927), 42-3. Hereafter, Patch.
30. Patch, 56-7.

31. "The Role of Fortune in 'The Testament of Cresseid'", Philological Quarterly XLVI (1967), 482.
32. For discussions of the role of Fortune in Troilus and Criseyde, see Ida L. Gordon, The Double Sorrow of Troilus (Oxford, 1970), esp. 4-8, and Kean, I, 138-44.
33. MacQueen states that the prayer to Venus is "unanswered" (Henryson, 52). In fact, there is no prayer at all, merely the "thocht" of one (25-6).
34. MacQueen, Henryson, 59-61.
35. The Bannatyne MS., IV, No. CCCLXXVIII, 98-102.
36. Fox, Testament, 93.
37. For a more detailed discussion, see MacQueen, Henryson, 62-3.
38. Fox, on the other hand, notes that the Chaucerian passage "can hardly be counted as a source" (Testament, 24).
39. See above, 106-7.
40. Spearing, 182.
41. Spearing, 182.
42. Fox, Testament, 53-5.
43. Fox, Testament, 23.
44. "Criseide and her Narrator", in Speaking of Chaucer (London, 1970), 65-83.
45. Fox, Testament, 56.
46. "Henryson as Authentic 'Chaucerian'", 96.
47. See Robinson, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, 812.
48. See the notes by James Kinsley (TLS, Nov. 14, 1952) and James Gray (TLS Mar. 13, 1953).
49. B. J. Whiting, "A Probable Allusion to Henryson's 'Testament of Cresseid'", MLR XL (1945), 46-7.
50. See above, 52.
51. M. W. Stearns, Robert Henryson (New York, 1949), 70-72.
52. Ed. O. L. Triggs (EETS ES 69, 1895).
53. Ed. H. Bergen (4 vols., EETS ES 97, 103, 106, 126, 1906-35), Book III, 4077-4263, 4642-59.

54. "The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare", PMLA XXXII (1917), 383-429. Hereafter, Rollins.
55. Rollins, 400.
56. "A proper ballad Dialoge wise betwene Troylus and Cressida", in The Paradyse of daynty deuises (1580): Rollins, 413-14.
57. Testament, 561-74: Troilus and Criseyde, V, 1058-66.
58. There are, as Rollins points out (389-92), a few early sixteenth century poems in which Cressid figures as the model courtly mistress.
59. Rollins, 404.
60. Rollins, 409.
61. "Dan Bartholmewes Dolorous Discourses": Rollins, 407.
62. Rollins, 401.
63. Rollins, 412.
64. Rollins, 421.
65. Quotations follow the Signet Classics edition, ed. D. Seltzer (New York and Scarborough, 1963).
66. Rollins, 429.
67. Geoffrey Bullough regards the Testament as simply an "analogue" of Troilus and Criseyde: Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare, VI (New York and London, 1966).
68. W. Meikle, ed., The Works of William Fowler, I (STS, 1914), 379-87. The best argument for Fowler's authorship is the fact that it occurs among the Hawthornden papers: see The Works of William Fowler, III (STS, 1940), 31-3.
69. Rollins quotes from poems by Turberville, Gascoigne, and an unidentified "R.L." (401-403, 407, 410). Wedderburne's "My luve was fals and full of flattry" is another example: The Bannatyne MS., IV, No. CCCXLV, 228-30.

Chapter IV

1. See I. W. A. Jamieson, The Poetry of Robert Henryson: A Study in the Uses of Source Material (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1965), and MacQueen, Henryson, Apps. II and III.
2. MacCracken, The Minor Poems, II, No. 24.
3. Pearsall, Lydgate, 193.
4. "The Cock and the Jasp", "The Two Mice", "The Sheep and the Dog", "The Wolf and the Wether", "The Wolf and the Lamb", and "The Paddock and the Mouse".
5. See John and Winifred MacQueen, eds., A Choice of Scottish Verse, 1470-1570 (London, 1972), 55-85. My quotations from "The Tod" are from this edition, which is based on the Bannatyne MS.
6. MacQueen, Henryson, 168.
7. Ed. D. B. Sands (Cambridge, Mass., 1960).
8. Ed. R. T. Lenaghan (Cambridge, Mass., 1967).
9. Scottish Vernacular Literature, 117.
10. Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century, 173-6.
11. Charles Elliott, ed., Robert Henryson: Poems (Oxford, 1963), Introduction, xx.
12. "Henryson and Chaucer: Cock and Fox", Texas Studies in Language and Literature VIII (1966), 451-61: "Chaucer's Influence on Henryson's Fables: The Use of Proverbs and Sententiae", MAe XXXIX (1970), 21-7.
13. "Henryson and Chaucer: Cock and Fox", 452.
14. J. R. Hulbert, "The Nun's Priest's Tale", in F. Bryan and G. Dempster, eds., The Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales' (Chicago, 1941), 645-63.
15. K. Sisam, ed., The Nun's Priest's Tale (Oxford, 1927), Introduction, xxvi-xxviii.
16. Kate O. Peterson, On The Sources of 'The Nonnes Preestes Tale' (Boston, 1898), 87-8.
17. The Poetry of Robert Henryson, Introduction, ii.
18. Kenneth Varty, Reynard the Fox: A Study of the Fox in Medieval English Art (Leicester, 1967), 38, plate 28. Hereafter, Varty.
19. Varty, 39, plate 38.

20. Varty, 38-9.
21. MacDonald mentions the visual evidence ("Henryson and Chaucer: Cock and Fox", 454), but is insensitive to its implications. There is no reason why the woman in the illustrations should be (a) poor, and (b) a widow.
22. MacQueen, Henryson, 220-21.
23. Varty, 41.
24. "Henryson and Chaucer: Cock and Fox", 455.
25. See Jamieson, The Poetry of Robert Henryson, 177.
26. G. Gregory Smith, ed., The Poems of Robert Henryson (3 vols., STS, 1906-10), I, 10.
27. I am indebted to Professor J. MacQueen for his opinion that Colkelbie Sow is later than The Cock and the Fox.
28. "Henryson and Chaucer: Cock and Fox", 455.
29. "Henryson and Chaucer: Cock and Fox", 455.
30. MacQueen, Henryson, 134-6.
31. Jamieson unjustifiably regards the last speaker as an authoritative figure, thereby underestimating the dramatic irony: The Poetry of Robert Henryson, 171.
32. MacQueen, Henryson, 143.
33. See, for example, R. O. Payne, The Key of Remembrance: A Study of Chaucer's Poetics (New Haven and London, 1963).
34. Pearsall, Lydgate, 194.
35. Harvey Wood punctuates this moralitas so that its last 23 lines are spoken by the narrator rather than by the sheep: The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson, 47-8.
36. Psalm CIV. iif: Chaucer's Boece, I, metrum v, 31f.
37. "The Tod", 89.7.
38. "The Paddock and the Mouse", 2836.
39. "Chaucer's Influence on Henryson's Fables", 22.
40. "Chaucer's Influence on Henryson's Fables", 22-3.
41. The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson, Introduction, xxv.

42. See above, 138.
43. The Scottish Tradition in Literature, 34-5.
44. Ed. W. A. Craigie, II (STS, 1925), 127-40. The poem has been edited by David Laing, Select Remains of the Ancient Popular and Romance Poetry of Scotland (Edinburgh and London, 1885), but my quotations are based directly on the Asloan text. (my punctuation)
45. Ed. J. H. Mozley and R. R. Raymo (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960).
46. MacQueen, Henryson, 191.
47. The Bannatyne MS., IV, 206-36.
48. "Geschichte der Fabeldichtung in England bis zu John Gay", Palaestra XLI (1906), xlvii.
49. The Poems of Robert Henryson, I, Introduction, xxxix.
50. Léopold Hervieux, ed., Les Fabulistes Latins, II (Paris, 1895), 317.
51. MacQueen, Henryson, 203-4.
52. "A Date for the Composition of Henryson's 'Fables'", JEGP LXI (1962), 588.
53. MacCracken, The Minor Poems, II, 574-8.
54. Pearsall, Lydgate, 195. See also Pearsall's account of the differences between Lydgate's approach and Henryson's (194-8).
55. "A Date for the Composition of Henryson's 'Fables'".
56. MacQueen, Henryson, Appendix III.
57. Henrisone's Fabeldichtungen (Halle, 1885), 10-12.
58. The Poems of Robert Henryson, I, Introduction, xxvii-xxviii.
59. MacQueen, Henryson, 214. See also Gavin Bone, "The Source of Henryson's 'Fox, Wolf, and Cadger'", RES X (1934), 319-20.
60. "Henryson and Caxton", JEGP LXVII (1968), 587.
61. "Henryson and Caxton", 587.
62. "A Date for the Composition of Henryson's 'Fables'", 589.
63. MacQueen, Henryson, 193.

64. MacQueen, Henryson, 209.
65. "Henryson and Caxton", 589.
66. MacQueen, Henryson, 209-14.
67. "Henryson and Caxton", 589.
68. MacQueen, Henryson, 211.
69. "Henryson and Caxton", 589: see also Jamieson, The Poetry of Robert Henryson, 216-17.
70. MacQueen, Henryson, 210.
71. "Henryson and Caxton", 590.
72. Crowne, "A Date for the Composition of Henryson's 'Fables'", 586.
73. "Henryson and Caxton", 590.
74. "Henryson and Caxton", 590.
75. I am grateful to Dr. J. Stevenson of the DOST for allowing me to consult material as yet unpublished.
76. "The Fables of Alfonse", ix: Lenaghan, 205-7.
77. MacQueen, Henryson, 219: Jamieson, The Poetry of Robert Henryson, 255: Crowne, "A Date for the Composition of Henryson's 'Fables'", 591.
78. "Henryson and Caxton", 591.
79. The only known copy of Smith's print is housed in the National Library of Scotland.
80. The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson, 222-3.
81. See below, 325-7.

Chapter V

1. Bawcutt, The Shorter Poems, xxix.
2. Jack, The Italian Influence on Scottish Literature, 23-7.
3. SSL VIII, ii (1970), 136.
4. "Chaucer's Einfluss auf die Originaldichtungen des Schotten Douglas", Anglia VI (1883), 54. Lange's arguments in favour of a Chaucerian influence on King Hart (which is probably not by Douglas) are not so convincing.
5. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 194-6.
6. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 193.
7. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 195.
8. Bawcutt, The Shorter Poems, xxxiv-xxxv.
9. Bawcutt, The Shorter Poems, xxxv-xxxvi.
10. Payne, The Key of Remembrance, 86-7.
11. Chaucer's 'Book of Fame' (Oxford, 1968), 136.
12. For a more detailed discussion of the importance of aesthetic issues in the meaning of Chaucer's poem, see Payne, The Key of Remembrance, 129-37.
13. Robinson, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, 780.
14. "The Poet in 'The Palice of Honour'", Chaucer Review III (1968-9), 287.
15. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 194.
16. E.g., Bawcutt, The Shorter Poems, xlv.
17. "The Poet in 'The Palice of Honour'", 299.
18. Bawcutt, The Shorter Poems, xlii-xliii.
19. Chaucer's 'Book of Fame', 74-5.
20. Chaucer's 'Book of Fame', 54.
21. Bawcutt, The Shorter Poems, xxxiv.
22. J. Small, ed., The Poetical Works of Gavin Douglas (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1874), I, lxii.
23. Lange, 75-7: Bawcutt, xxxiv: Fox, 195.

24. It is possible that Douglas may have borrowed the detail of the "ten stages of Topas" from The Assembly of Ladies, where the goddess sits in a sapphire-encrusted chair "fyve stages.. fro the ground" (477).
25. Bawcutt, The Shorter Poems, xlix. For a fuller discussion of Douglas's stylistic variety, see xlvi-l.
26. History of Scottish Poetry (Edinburgh, 1861), 266.
27. Scottish Vernacular Literature, 194.
28. The Allegory of Love, 290.
29. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 196.
30. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 199.
31. Pearsall, Lydgate, 262.

Chapter VI

1. See above, 20-22.
2. See Smith, The French Background, 38-40, and Clapper-ton's "In Bowdoun on Blak Monunday", Ballattis of Luve, 68-70.
3. See also James Kinsley, "The Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo", MAe XXIII (1954), 31-5.
4. Bawcutt suggests a source for the dog image in The Parson's Tale: "Dunbar's 'Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo'", 185-7, and Chaucer's 'Parson's Tale', N&Q XI (1964), 332-3.
5. For a more detailed discussion, see Bawcutt, "Aspects of Dunbar's Imagery", in Chaucer and Middle English Studies in Honour of Rossell Hope Robbins, ed. B. Rowland (London, 1974), 196-9.
6. In Bryan and Dempster, eds., Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales', 207-22.
7. Smith, The French Background, 39-40.
8. Dunbar: A Critical Exposition of the Poems (Edinburgh and London, 1966), 204. Hereafter, Scott, Dunbar.
9. Scott, Dunbar, 204.
10. J. Schipper, William Dunbar: Sein Leben und Seine Gedichte (Berlin, 1884); J. Baxter, William Dunbar: A Biographical Study (Edinburgh and London, 1954), 129; James Kinsley, ed., William Dunbar: Poems (Oxford, 1958), 131.
11. "Sir Thopas and Sir Thomas Norny: Romance Parody in Chaucer and Dunbar", RES NS XXII (1971), 401-9.
12. "'Sir Thomas Norray' and 'Sir Thopas'", MLN XXV (1910), 78-80.
13. "Sir Thopas and Sir Thomas Norny", 405.
14. "'The Canterbury Tales': Style of the Man and Style of the Work", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, 111.
15. Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, III, ed. T. Dickson (Edinburgh, 1901), 166, 375.
16. G. F. Black, The Surnames of Scotland (New York, 1962), 632.
17. R. L. Mackie, King James IV of Scotland: A Brief Survey of His Life and Times (Edinburgh, 1958), 122-4. Hereafter Mackie, James IV.

18. Scott, Dunbar, 217.
19. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 186.
20. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 186-7.
21. "William Dunbar as a Scottish Lydgatian", PMLA XLVI (1931), 223.
22. MacCracken, The Minor Poems, I, 68.
23. Scott, Dunbar, Ch. XIV, 306-31.
24. Scott, Dunbar, 313.
25. Scott, Dunbar, 311.
26. "The Scottish Chaucerians", 186.
27. D. S. Brewer, "Images of Chaucer, 1386-1900", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, 244.
28. "Images of Chaucer, 1386-1900", 248.
29. "William Dunbar as a Scottish Lydgatian", 224.
30. MacCracken, The Minor Poems, II, Nos. 9-10, 429-32.
31. MacCracken, The Minor Poems, II, Nos. 56-77, 744-847.
32. "Dunbar and Lydgate", SSL VIII, iv (1971), 219.
33. MacCracken, The Minor Poems, II, No. 73, 828-32.
34. The Dance of Death, ed. F. Warren and B. White (EETS OS 181).
35. MacCracken, The Minor Poems, I, No. 68, 329-62.
36. R. D. Stevick, ed., One Hundred Middle English Lyrics (New York, 1964), Nos. 78, 79.
37. Scott, Dunbar, 251.
38. See, for example, C. Brown, ed., Religious Lyrics of the XIII Century (Oxford, 1932), No. 51; Brown, ed., Religious Lyrics of the XIV Century (Oxford, 1952), No. 6. The technique is discussed by Rosemary Woolf, The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages (Oxford, 1968), 102-6, 332-4.
39. Pearsall, Lydgate, 177-8.
40. For a detailed description of the Roslin Totentanz, see John Thompson, Guide to Rosslyn Chapel and Castle (Edinburgh, 1922), 60-62. The Roslin murals are not mentioned in the list in the EETS edition of the Dauunce.

41. C. Brown, ed., Religious Lyrics of the XV Century, No. 158.
42. "William Dunbar as a Scottish Lydgatian", 216.
43. "Dunbar and Lydgate", 220-21.
44. "Dunbar and Lydgate", 222-6.
45. "Dunbar and Lydgate", 224.
46. In his edition of the poem, E. Sieper uses "Apollo" in the marginal summary: Reson and Sensuallyte (EETS ES 84; 1901), 45.
47. R. J. Lyall, "Moral Allegory in Dunbar's 'Golden Targe'", SSL XI, i (1973), 47-65.
48. MacCracken, The Minor Poems, I, No. 57, 291-2.
49. Pearsall, Lydgate, 268.
50. See also Jack, "Dunbar and Lydgate", 219.
51. "Amoryus and Cleopes", l. 2194: John Metham's Works, ed. H. Craig (EETS OS 132, 1906).
52. A. K. Moore comments; "In 'Ane Ballat of Our Lady' internal rhyme and aureate diction reach an abominable limit": The Secular Lyric in Middle English (Lexington, 1951), 198.
53. Scott, Dunbar, 304.
54. "Dunbar and Lydgate", 216-18.
55. "Dunbar and Lydgate", 217.
56. All quotations from Skelton follow A. Dyce, ed., The Poetical Works of John Skelton (2 vols., London, 1843).

Chapter VII

1. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, 136. See also Henderson, Scottish Vernacular Literature, 85.
2. The Bannatyne MS., IV, No. CCCCI, 279-308. The poem is also accessible (with modern punctuation) in David Laing's Select Remains of the Ancient Popular and Romance Poetry of Scotland. My quotations are based directly on the Bannatyne text.
3. Some Comic and Burlesque Poems in Two Sixteenth Century Manuscript Anthologies (unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1952), 306G. Hereafter, Guy.
4. John Skelton (Melbourne and London, 1943), 194. Hereafter Gordon, Skelton.
5. John Skelton, Laureate (New York, 1939), 90-93. Hereafter Nelson, Skelton.
6. Skelton: The Life and Times of an Early Tudor Poet (London, 1949), 87-8. Hereafter Edwards, Skelton.
7. Edwards, Skelton, 87-8.
8. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, 136.
9. Edwards, Skelton, 122-3.
10. M. Pollet, John Skelton: Poet of Tudor England, tr. J. Warrington (London, 1971), 104-5. Hereafter Pollet, Skelton.
11. Guy, 306D.
12. Nelson, Skelton, 86.
13. Guy, 306H.
14. Pollet, Skelton, 106.
15. See Pollet, Skelton, Appendix II, where the text of Gossips' Meeting is printed beside the relevant extracts from Elynour Rummyng.
16. Songs and Carols, now first printed from a Manuscript of the Fifteenth Century, Percy Society, Vol. XXIII (London, 1847).
17. R. Dyboski, ed., Songs, Carols, and other Miscellaneous Poems (EETS ES 101, 1907), Introduction, xiii-xvi.
18. Review of J. W. Baxter, William Dunbar: SHR XXXII (1954), 46-52.

19. Gordon, Skelton, 188.
20. See Smith, The French Background, 52-7.
21. "Skelton-Studien", Englische Studien XXXVII (1907), 1-86.
22. "Skelton-Studien", 63-4.
23. Edwards, Skelton, 77.
24. G. Gregory Smith, Scottish Literature: Character and Influence (London, 1919), 13: Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, 17 (disagreeing with the label).
25. Gordon, Skelton, 132-3.
26. "The Two Voices of William Dunbar", University of Toronto Quarterly XXXI (1962), 323.
27. Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, 97.
28. J. Small, ed., The Poems of William Dunbar (3 vols., STS, 1893), I, Introduction, cxx: Dyce, The Poetical Works of John Skelton, II, 347: Gordon, Skelton, 160: Guy, 306G.
29. The Bannatyne MS., II, 150.
30. The Maitland Folio MS., I, 213.
31. The Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland, I, ed. M. Livingstone (Edinburgh, 1908), Items 2040, 2269, 2572-3, 2679, 2955, 4025, 4119.
32. Hamer, The Works, III, 75.
33. The Poems of William Dunbar, 224-5.
34. W. Croft Dickinson, Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603 (London, 1961), 306-7.
35. See C. W. Cunnington, et al., A Dictionary of English Costume, 900-1900 (London, 1960), 77: A Book of Costume (London, 1847), 218: M. C. Linthicum, Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries (Oxford, 1936), 179-82.
36. My view has the support of Professor James Kinsley, in whose forthcoming edition of Dunbar A General Satyre will not appear: On Editing Dunbar, a paper read at the First International Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Scottish Literature; Edinburgh, September, 1975.
37. Hamer, The Works, III, 75.

38. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. CXXVIII, 208-11.
39. Gordon, Skelton, 115-16.
40. TLS, January 17, 1935.
41. The Bannatyne MS., III, No. CCLXXVI, 295.
42. B. J. Whiting, Proverbs, Sentences, and Proverbial Phrases (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1968), T311, T313, T318.
43. R. Girvan, ed., Ratis Raving and Other Early Scots Poems on Morals (STS, 1939), 181-2.
44. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. XXVI, 57.
45. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. CI, 185.
46. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. LXXXVI, 174-5.
47. The Bannatyne MS., II, No. CLXXXIV, 324: III, No. CCXVIII, 43-4. See also The Maitland Folio MS., I, CXXI, CXXII, 344.
48. See, for example, Robbins, Secular Lyrics of the XIV and XV Centuries, No. 120.
49. The Poems of King James VI of Scotland, I, 89-90.
50. Baxter, Dunbar, 85.
51. Mackie, James IV, 95, n.4.
52. Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York, ed. N. H. Nicolas (London, 1830), 28.
53. MacQueen, "Some Aspects of the Early Renaissance in Scotland", 208-9.
54. Brie suggests that one Adam Dundas may have written the poem ("Skelton-Studien", 67). Adam Dundas, an agent of Albany, was in England in 1523 (Calendar of Letters and Papers... of the Reign of Henry VIII, arr. J. Brewer, et al., III, Items 3465-6), but he was hardly likely to draw attention to his presence by writing lampoons. Skelton's reference to "dunghill knight" points to Sir George Dundas.
55. These and the following facts are from C. M. MacDonald's essay, "The Struggle of George Dundas for the Preceptory of Torphichen", SHR XIV (1916), 19-48.
56. The Life of St. Werburghe, ed. C. Horstmann (EETS OS 88, 1887), 199.

Chapter VIII

1. Emrys Jones, ed., Henry Howard Earl of Surrey: Poems (Oxford, 1964), No. 20.
2. J. A. W. Bennett, "The Early Fame of Gavin Douglas's 'Eneados'", MLN LXI (1946), 83-7.
3. Surrey's first tutor was the humanist translator, John Clerke: see E. Casady, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (New York, 1938), 27-8. Casady suggests that the education of Richmond and Surrey was supervised, at least for a short time, by Wolsey (33). In the year before Douglas's death, he corresponded with Wolsey, and became acquainted with Polydore Virgil. See Small, The Poetical Works, I, xcvi-cvi, cxvii.
4. The Dictionary of National Biography, ed. L. Stephen and S. Lee, V (1917; repr. Oxford, 1970), 1244-8.
5. See below, 325-8.
6. Florence H. Ridley, ed., The 'Aeneid' of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963). All quotations follow this edition.
7. G. F. Nott, ed., The Works of Henry Howard (2 vols., London, 1815), I, cciii-ccix. For a detailed account of the views which have been put for and against Surrey's reliance on Douglas, see Ridley, 16-22, and her "Surrey's Debt to Gavin Douglas", PMLA LXXVI (1961), 25-33.
8. Ridley, The 'Aeneid' of Henry Howard, 18-27.
9. For the relationship between the translations of Douglas and Saint Gelais, see A. Schumacher, Des Bischofs Gavin Douglas Übersetzung der Aeneis Vergils (Strassburg, 1910), 122-6.
10. Coldwell, Virgil's 'Aeneid' Translated into Scottish Verse, IV, 41.
11. Quotations from the Aeneid follow the edition of J. W. Mackail (Oxford, 1930).
12. The 'Aeneid' of Henry Howard, 43-4.
13. See the lists compiled by M. M. Gray (TLS October 3, 1936) and Edith Bannister (TLS October 24, 1936).
14. "Über Surreys Virgilübersetzung, nebst Neuausgabe des vierten Buches, nach Tottels Originaldruck und der bisher ungedruckten Hargrave 205", Palaestra XXXIV (Berlin, 1905).

15. The 'Aeneid' of Henry Howard, 44-5.
16. Compare H. A. Mason's discussion of the hunting scene (Dg., p.163, 51ff: S., IV, 199f.): Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period, 249-50.
17. The 'Aeneid' of Henry Howard, 33.
18. The 'Aeneid' of Henry Howard, 34.
19. Virgil's 'Aeneid' Translated into Scottish Verse, I, 59.
20. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, 234.
21. Cited in Ridley, "Surrey's Debt to Gawin Douglas", 25.
22. 'The Arte of English Poesie' by George Puttenham, ed. G. Willcock and A. Walker (Cambridge, 1936), 60.
23. The Arte of English Poesie, 145.
24. Kenneth Muir, ed., Collected Poems of Thomas Wyatt (London, 1949), No. 197.
25. Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period, 227.
26. Niall Rudd, The Satires of Horace (Cambridge, 1966), 252.
27. For a fuller account of the similarities and differences between the two fables, see Patricia Thomson, Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background (Stanford, 1964), 265-6.
28. Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period, 171.
29. Collected Poems of Thomas Wyatt, No. 92.
30. Collected Poems of Thomas Wyatt, No. 127.
31. Thomson, 126.
32. Collected Poems of Thomas Wyatt, No. 17.
33. Ballattis of Luve, XXX.
34. Ballattis of Luve, XXXVII.
35. Collected Poems of Thomas Wyatt, No. 58.
36. Collected Poems of Thomas Wyatt, No. 103.
37. The Italian Influence on Scottish Literature, 29, 42.
38. "Alexander Scott and Scottish Court Poetry", PBA LIV (1968), 116.

Chapter IX

1. Medieval Plays in Scotland (Edinburgh and London, 1927), 101-2.
2. Medieval Plays in Scotland, Appendix I, 113-291.
3. J. A. Lester, "Some Franco-Scottish Influences on the Early English Drama", Haverford Essays: Studies in Modern Literature (Haverford, Pa., 1909), 132-3: A. J. Mill, "The Influence of Continental Drama on Lyndsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'", MLR XXV (1930), 425-42: Smith, The French Background, 126-30: E. K. Chambers, The Medieval Stage (2 vols., Oxford, 1903), II, 157.
4. "The Influence of Continental Drama on Lyndsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'", 425.
5. R. L. Ramsay, in his EETS edition of Magnyfycence (ES 98, 1906), sets the date of the first edition at 1530 or 1531 (Introduction, xix). All quotations are from this edition. Hereafter, Ramsay.
6. Hamer, The Works, IV, xx, 259-60. Quotations are from Hamer's edition of the Charteris Quarto.
7. Ramsay, xvi-xxi.
8. A. Brandl, ed., Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare (Strassburg, 1898), 1-35. Hereafter, Brandl.
9. I have followed the dating scheme adopted by A. Harbage, Annals of English Drama, 975-1700, rev. S. Schoenbaum (London, 1974).
10. F. J. Furnivall and A. W. Pollard, eds., The Macro Plays (EETS ES 91, 1904), 75-186.
11. J. M. Manly, ed., Specimens of the Pre-Shakspearean Drama (2 vols., Boston, 1897), I, 315-52. Hereafter, Manly.
12. Brandl, 73-158.
13. Manly, 353-85.
14. For appreciations of their dramatic virtues, see W. Farnham, The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (Berkeley, 1936), 173-212, and Chambers, The Medieval Stage, II, 151-7. I have not referred to "specialized" moralities such as Everyman, which concentrates on the coming of death, nor on Wisdom, which has an unusually heavy dialectal emphasis. In the latter, the traditional Mankind protagonist is replaced by allegorical representations of the power of the soul.

15. Chambers, The Medieval Stage, II, 151.
16. Edwards, Skelton, 172.
17. Leigh Winser argues that the French king referred to is Louis XI, who died in 1483: "Skelton's 'Magnyfycence'", Renaissance Quarterly XXIII (1970). The main, but not the only, obstacle to this view is that the play would need to have been written shortly after this for the allusion to have any point. Winser suggests that the play was written to advise the young princes, but Arthur and Henry were not born until 1486 and 1491.
18. Ramsay, xxiii-xxv.
19. Gordon, Skelton, 137.
20. Ramsay, cxxiii-cxxiv.
21. Colyn Cloute, 475-81, 930-1050: Why Come Ye Nat to Courte?, 396-442.
22. Ramsay, cxv-cxvi.
23. Ramsay, cxiii-cxvi.
24. Ramsay, cxi-cxii.
25. "Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis", SSL III, iii (1966), 136. Hereafter MacQueen, "Thrie Estaitis".
26. MacQueen, "Thrie Estaitis", 137-9.
27. A. J. Mill, "The Original Version of Lindsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'", SSL VI, ii (1968), 69-70: V. Harward, "'Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis' Again", SSL VII, iii (1970), 141-2. The arguments advanced by MacQueen, Mill, and Harward, are summarized by J. S. Kantrowitz, "Encore: Lindsay's 'Thrie Estaitis', Date and New Evidence", SSL X, i (1972), 18-32. Kantrowitz supports the mid-century dating of Mill and Harward, on the basis of topical references which include mention of the "Pater Noster controversy" of 1549: 25-30.
28. "'Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis' Again", 143.
29. See J. S. Kantrowitz, Dramatic Allegory: Lindsay's 'Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis' (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1975), 36, 58, n. 19.
30. History and Chronicles of Scotland, I, 408-9.
31. MacQueen, "Thrie Estaitis", 138.
32. Kantrowitz, Dramatic Allegory, 36-7.

33. The Poor Man refers pointedly to "an other king in scotlande that hanged John Armestrang with his fellowes.." Hamer, II, 5.
34. Sensualitie's magnificent rhetoric (279-94) must cast doubt upon F. P. Wilson's view of Lindsay's "incapability for song or for lyrical verse of any kind or for solemn music": The English Drama, 1485-1585 (Oxford, 1969), 19-20.
35. For other examples of false-naming, see B. Spivack, Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil (New York, 1958), 155-60.
36. "'Actors' and 'Play Acting' in the Morality Tradition", Renaissance Drama III (1970), 195.
37. "'Actors' and 'Play Acting'", 203.
38. In Medwall's Nature, Sloth rebukes Pride for calling him by his true name: "'Actors' and 'Play Acting'", 203.
39. "The Influence of Continental Drama on Lyndsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'", 436.
40. "The Influence of Continental Drama on Lyndsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'", 436.
41. Ramsay, xlvi.
42. Ramsay, xcix-ci.
43. Ramsay, xlvi.
44. Towards the end of his speech, Folie refers to "Gillymouband" and "gude Cacaphatie" (4608, 4610). The Treasurer's Accounts confirm the existence of "a fule callit Gillemowband": Hamer, The Works, IV, 240.
45. In Mundus et Infans, Conscience explains to Mankind that flattering Folly is but another name for the Seven Deadly Sins (458-61).
46. Quoted by A. Dyce, ed., The Poetical Works of John Skelton, I, 1.
47. Clokyd Colusyon boasts "Comberaunce and trouble in England fyrst I began" (715).
48. MacQueen, "Thrie Estaitis", 130-31.
49. Ramsay, ix.
50. Ramsay, ix.
51. A detailed analysis of the relationship between Ane Satyre and French drama is beyond the scope of this

- study: see Lester, "Some Franco-Scottish Influences on the Early English Drama", 139-41, and Mill, "The Influence of Continental Drama on Lyndsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'", 437-42.
52. "Some Franco-Scottish Influences on the Early English Drama", 137.
 53. A History of English Literature to the Death of Queen Anne (2 vols., London, 1875), I, 132.
 54. See Hamer, The Works, IV, 160, for a summary of critical opinion.
 55. 'King Johan' by John Bale, ed. J. H. P. Pafford (Oxford, 1931), xx.
 56. Working on the basis of allusions in the text and on the nature of the surviving manuscript, Pafford suggests that the play was written before 1536, revised for a performance under the patronage of Thomas Cromwell in 1539, possibly again during the reign of Edward VI, and yet again before Elizabeth's visit to Ipswich in 1561 (xxii-xxiii). T. B. Blatt doubts the validity of the proposed Edwardian recension: The Plays of John Bale (Copenhagen, 1968), 101.
 57. The Works, IV, 160.
 58. The English Drama, 1485-1585, 36.
 59. 'King Johan' by John Bale, xv.
 60. Blatt explains why it is not illogical for Bale to exhort Leland to arise from the dead: The Plays of John Bale, 102.
 61. The Plays of John Bale, 123.
 62. Ed. M. and A. H. Bullen (EETS ES 52, 1888).
 63. Ed. L. A. Magnus (EETS ES 94, 1905).
 64. Hamer, The Works, IV, 139.
 65. The Bannatyne MS., III, 101.

Chapter X

1. Ed. J. A. H. Murray (EETS ES 17, 1872), 106.
2. The "Monologue Recreative" lists a number of English compositions: see Murray, Introduction, lxxiii-xci.
3. The Castell of Pleasure (EETS OS 179, 1928), Introduction, 19.
4. MacQueen, Henryson, 154-6.
5. Ballattis of Luve, xxiv-xxv: see also B. Vogel, "Secular Politics and the Date of 'Lancelot of the Laik'", Studies in Philology XL (1943), 4-5.
6. I have nothing to add to McDiarmid's refutation of the theory that Lancelot was written by James I: The Kingis Quair, 31-4.
7. Alceste, in the Prologue to The Legend of Good Women.
8. Ballattis of Luve, xxv.
9. The Kingis Quair, 46.
10. Ballattis of Luve, No. XXXIV.
11. MacQueen, Henryson, 168.
12. Pearsall, Lydgate, 68.
13. Pearsall, Lydgate, 68.
14. For a fuller discussion than I am able to provide here, see Triggs, The Assembly of Gods, xiv-xx, and Hammond, English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey, 258-60.
15. Ed. W. E. Mead (EETS OS 173, 1928).
16. Mead, Introduction, cvi.
17. Ed. F. W. Gluck and A. B. Morgan (EETS OS 271, 1974).
18. Ed. A. W. Pollard (Edinburgh, 1905).
19. Ed. T. H. Jamieson (Edinburgh, 1874).
20. Ed. B. White (EETS OS 175, 1928).
21. A Dialogue Against the Fever Pestilence, 17, ll. 30-31.
22. On this point see W. S. Ramson, "In Praise of Chaucer", Proceedings of AULLA XII (Sydney, 1970).

23. Pearsall, Lydgate, 156.
24. Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, 636.
25. As suggested by N. F. Blake, "The Fifteenth Century Reconsidered", Neuphilologische Mitteilungen LXXI (1970), 146-57.
26. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, 142.
27. See Pearsall, ed., The Floure and the Leafe and the Assembly of Ladies (London, 1962), Introduction, 19-20.
28. Chaucerian and Other Pieces, Introduction, lxxvi-lxxx.
29. The History of English Poetry, ed. W. C. Hazlitt (London, 1871), III, 204.
30. For the most recent discussion, see I. W. A. Jamieson, "The Minor Poems of Robert Henryson", SSL IX, ii (1971), 125-47.
31. McDiarmid, The Kingis Quair, 46-7.
32. Ed. W. C. Hazlitt, Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England, III (London, 1864).
33. C. S. Lewis provides an interesting, if ingenious, explanation of the "broken-backed" line which is so common in fifteenth century poetry: "The Fifteenth Century Heroic Line", Essays and Studies XXIV (1938), 28-41.
34. "Gavin Douglas's 'Eneados': Dilemmas in the Nature Prologues", SSL XI, i (1973), 92.
35. Cited by W. Murison, "Stephen Hawes", The Cambridge History of English Literature II, 224.
36. Ed. W. Greȝor (STS, 1884).
37. "Dunbar and Lydgate", 215, 218.

Select Bibliography

Adamson, J. W. "The Extent of Literacy in England in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries: Notes and Conjectures". The Library, 4th Series X (1929-30), 163-93.

Aitken, A. J., et al., eds. Edinburgh Studies in English and Scots. London, 1971.

_____. "Variation and variety in written Middle Scots", in Edinburgh Studies in English and Scots, 177-209.

Amours, F. J., ed. Scottish Alliterative Poems in Riming Stanzas. 2 vols. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 27, 38. Edinburgh and London, 1897.

Anon. A Book of Costume. London, 1847.

Ashby, George. George Ashby's Poems. Ed. M. Bateson. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 76. London, 1899.

The Asloan Manuscript. Ed. W. A. Craigie. 2 vols. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 14, 16. Edinburgh and London, 1923-5.

The Assembly of Gods. Ed. O. L. Triggs. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 69. London, 1896.

Aswell, E. Duncan. "The Role of Fortune in 'The Testament of Cresseid'". Philological Quarterly, XLVI (1967), 471-87.

Atkins, J. W. H. English Literary Criticism: The Medieval Phase. Cambridge, 1934.

Audelay, John. The Poems of John Audelay. Ed. E. K. Whiting. Early English Text Society, Original Series 184. London, 1931.

Bain, C. E. "The Nightingale and the Dove in 'The Kingis Quair'". Tennessee Studies in Literature, IX (1964), 19-29.

Bain, J., ed. Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1881-8.

Bald, M. A. "The Pioneers of Anglicized Speech in Scotland", Scottish Historical Review, XXIV (1927), 179-93.

Bale, John. Index Britanniae Scriptorum. Ed. R. Poole and M. Bateson. Oxford, 1902.

_____. King Johan. Ed. J. H. P. Pafford. The Malone Society Reprints. Oxford, 1931.

Balfour-Melville, E. M. W. James 1, King of Scots, 1406-37. London, 1936.

The Bannatyne Miscellany. Bannatyne Club, Vol. 2. Edinburgh, 1836.

The Bannatyne Manuscript. Ed. W. Tod Ritchie. 4 vols. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 22-3, 26, 3rd Series, 5. Edinburgh and London, 1927-30, 1931-2.

Bannister, Edith. "Surrey's Vocabulary". Times Literary Supplement, October 24, 1936.

Barbour, John. The Bruce. Ed. W. Mackay Mackenzie. London, 1909.

Barclay, Alexander. The Eclogues of Alexander Barclay. Ed. B. White. Early English Text Society, Original Series 175. London, 1928.

_____. The Ship of Fools. Ed. T. H. Jamieson. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1874.

_____. See The Castell of Labour.

Bauman, R. "The Folktale and Oral Tradition in the Fables of Robert Henryson". Fabula, VI (1963), 108-24.

Bawcutt, Priscilla. "Gavin Douglas and Chaucer". Review of English Studies, New Series XXI (1970), 401-21.

_____. "Aspects of Dunbar's Imagery", in Chaucer and Middle English Studies, ed. B. Rowland, 190-99.

_____. "Dunbar's 'Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo'", 185-187, and Chaucer's 'Parson's Tale'. Notes and Queries, XI (1964), 332-3.

Baxter, J.W. William Dunbar: A Biographical Study. Edinburgh and London, 1954.

Beattie, William. The Chepman and Myllar Prints: a Facsimile with a Bibliographical Note. Edinburgh Bibliographical Society. Edinburgh, 1950.

Bennett, Edith. "A New Version of a Scottish Poem". Modern Language Review, XXXIII (1938), 403.

Bennett, H.S. Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century. Oxford, 1947.

_____. "The Production and Dissemination of Vernacular Manuscripts in the Fifteenth Century". The Library, 5th Series I (1946-7), 167-83.

Bennett, J. A. W. 'The Parlement of Foules': An Interpretation. Oxford, 1957.

_____. Chaucer's 'Book of Fame'. Oxford, 1968.

_____. "The Early Fame of Gavin Douglas's 'Eneados'". Modern Language Notes, LXI (1946), 83-8.

Bennett, J. A. W. "Henryson's 'Testament': a flawed masterpiece". Scottish Literary Journal, I, i (1974), 5-16.

_____, ed. Devotional Pieces in Verse and Prose. Scottish Text Society, 3rd Series, 23. Edinburgh and London, 1955.

Berdan, J. M. Early Tudor Poetry. New York, 1920.

Bethurum, Dorothy, ed. Critical Approaches to Medieval Literature: Selected Papers from the English Institute, 1958-1959. New York, 1960.

Bevington, D. M. Tudor Drama and Politics. Cambridge, Mass., 1968.

_____. "The Obtuse Narrator in Chaucer's 'House of Fame'". Speculum, XXXVI (1961), 288-98.

Black, G. F. The Surnames of Scotland. New York, 1962.

Blake, N. F. Caxton and His World. London, 1969.

_____. "The Fifteenth Century Reconsidered". Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, LXXI (1970), 146-57.

Blatt, Thora B. The Plays of John Bale. Copenhagen, 1968.

Blench, J. W. Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. Oxford, 1964.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. Genealogie Deorum Gentilium Libri. Ed. V. Romano. 2 vols. Bari, 1951.

Bone, Gavin. "The Source of Henryson's 'Fox, Wolf, and Cadger'". Review of English Studies, X (1934), 319-20.

Bradshaw, Henry. Henry Bradshaw's Life of St. Werburghe. Ed. C. Horstmann. Early English Text Society, Original Series 88. London, 1887.

Brandl, A., ed. Quellen des Weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare. Strassburg, 1898.

Brewer, D. S., ed. Chaucer and Chaucerians: Critical Studies in Middle English Literature. London, 1966.

_____. "The Relationship of Chaucer to the English and European Traditions", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, 1-38.

_____. "Images of Chaucer, 1386-1900", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, 240-70.

Brie, F. Die nationale Literatur Schottlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance. Halle, 1937.

Brie, F. "Skelton-Studien". Englische Studien, XXXVII (1907), 1-86.

Bronson, B. H. In Search of Chaucer. Toronto, 1960.

Brown, Carleton, ed. English Lyrics of the Thirteenth Century. Oxford, 1932.

_____, ed. Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century. Rev. G. V. Smithers. Oxford, 1952.

_____, ed. Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century. Oxford, 1939.

_____, and R. H. Robbins, comps. The Index of Middle English Verse. New York, 1943.

Brown, I. "The Mental Traveller: A Study of 'The Kingis Quair'", Studies in Scottish Literature, V, iv (1968), 246-52.

Brown, J. T. T. The Kingis Quair: A New Criticism. Glasgow, 1896.

_____, ed. The Quare of Jelusy. Scottish Text Society Miscellany Volume, 3rd Series, 4. Edinburgh and London, 1933.

Bryan, F., and Dempster, G., eds. The Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales'. Chicago, 1941.

The Buik of Alexander. Ed. R. L. Graeme Ritchie. 4 vols. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 12, 17, 21, 25. Edinburgh and London, 1925-9.

Bullein, William. Bullein's 'Dialogue against the Feuer Pestilence'. Ed. M. W. and A. H. Bullen. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 52. London, 1888.

Bullough, Geoffrey. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. VI. New York and London, 1966.

Calendar of Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Arranged and catalogued by J. S. Brewer, et al. 21 vols. London, 1862-1910.

Carpenter, Nan. C. "Skelton and Music: 'Roty Bully Joys'". Review of English Studies, New Series VI (1955), 279-84.

Casady, E. Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. New York, 1938.

The Castell of Labour. Ed. A. W. Pollard. Roxburghe Club. Edinburgh, 1905.

Caxton, William. The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton. Ed. W. J. B. Crotch. Early English Text Society, Original Series 176 (1928).

Caxton, William. The Boke of Eneydos. Ed. W. T. Culley and F. J. Furnivall. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 57 (1890).

_____. Caxton's Aesop. Ed. R. T. Lenaghan. Cambridge, Mass., 1967.

_____. The History of Reynard the Fox. Ed. D. B. Sands. Cambridge, Mass., 1960.

Chambers, E. K. The Medieval Stage. 2 vols. Oxford, 1903.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Ed. F. N. Robinson. 2nd ed., London, 1957.

_____. The Works, 1532: with supplementary material from the editions of 1542, 1561, 1598, and 1602. Scholar Press facsimile. Ilkley, 1969.

_____. The Nun's Priest's Tale. Ed. K. Sisam. Oxford, 1927.

Chaytor, H. J. From Script to Print. London, 1945.

Clanvowe, Thomas. The Cuckoo and the Nightingale, in W. W. Skeat, ed., Chaucerian and other Pieces.

Clemen, Wolfgang. Chaucer's Early Poetry. Tr. C. A. M. Sym. London, 1963.

The Complaynt of Scotlande. Ed. J. A. H. Murray. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 17, 18. London, 1872-3.

Conway, Agnes. Henry VII's Relations with Scotland and Ireland, 1485-1498. Cambridge, 1932.

The Court of Love. Ed. W. W. Skeat, Chaucerian and other Pieces.

The Court of Venus. Ed. R. A. Fraser. Durham, N. C., 1955.

Craigie, W. A. "The Scottish Alliterative Poems". (Gollancz Memorial Lecture) Proceedings of the British Academy, XXVIII (1942), 217-36.

_____. "The Language of the 'Kingis Quair'". Essays and Studies, XXV (1939), 22-38.

_____. See The Asloan Manuscript.

_____. See The Maitland Folio Manuscript.

_____. See The Maitland Quarto Manuscript.

Crosby, Ruth. "Oral Delivery in the Middle Ages". Speculum, XL (1936), 88-110.

Crosby, Ruth. "Chaucer and the Custom of Oral Delivery". Speculum, XLIII (1938), 413-22.

Crowne, David K. "A Date for the Composition of Henryson's Fables". Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LXI (1962), 583-90.

Cunnington, C. W., et al. A Dictionary of English Costume, 900-1900. London, 1960.

Curtius, E. R. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages. Tr. W. R. Trask. London, 1953.

David, A. "Literary Satire in 'The Hous of Fame'". Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LXXV (1960), 330-39.

Davies, R. T., ed. Medieval English Lyrics: A Critical Anthology. London, 1963.

Davis, N., ed. Paston Letters and Papers of the Fifteenth Century. Part I. Oxford, 1971.

Dickinson, W. Croft. Scotland from the Earliest Times to 1603. London, 1961.

Diebler, A. R. Henrisone's Fabeldichtungen. Halle, 1885.

Donaldson, E. Talbot. Speaking of Chaucer. London, 1970.

_____. "Chaucer the Pilgrim". Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LXIX (1954), 928-36.

Douglas, Gavin. The Shorter Poems of Gavin Douglas. Ed. Priscilla Bawcutt. Scottish Text Society, 4th Series, 3. Edinburgh and London, 1967.

_____. Virgil's 'Aeneid' Translated into Scottish Verse by Gavin Douglas. Ed. D. F. C. Coldwell. 4 vols. Scottish Text Society, 3rd Series, 27-30. Edinburgh and London, 1957-64.

_____. The Poetical Works of Gavin Douglas, Bishop of Dunkeld. Ed. J. Small. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1874.

Dunbar, William. The Poems of William Dunbar. Ed. W. Mackay Mackenzie. London, 1932; repr. 1970.

_____. William Dunbar: Poems. Ed. J. Kinsley. Oxford, 1958.

_____. The Poems of William Dunbar. Ed. J. Small. 3 vols. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series 2, 4. Edinburgh and London, 1893: Introduction by Ae. J. G. Mackay, Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 16 (1893).

Duncan, Douglas. "Henryson's 'Testament of Cresseid'". Essays in Criticism, XI (1961), 128-35.

Dunlop, A. I. The Life and Times of James Kennedy, Bishop of St. Andrews. Edinburgh, 1950.

Durkan, John. "Education in the Century of the Reformation", in Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513-1625, ed. David McRoberts, 145-68.

_____. "The Cultural Background in Sixteenth Century Scotland", in Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513-1625, ed. David McRoberts, 274-331.

_____, and A. Ross, comps. Early Scottish Libraries. Glasgow, 1961.

Dyboski, Roman, ed. Songs, Carols, and other Miscellaneous Poems. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 101. London, 1907.

Ebin, Lois. Review of Bawcutt, ed., The Shorter Poems of Gavin Douglas. Studies in Scottish Literature, VIII, ii (1970), 135-7.

Eddy, Elizabeth R. "Sir Thopas and Sir Thomas Norny: Romance Parody in Chaucer and Dunbar". Review of English Studies, New Series XXII (1971), 401-9.

Edwards, H. L. R. Skelton: The Life and Times of an Early Tudor Poet. London, 1949.

_____, and W. Nelson. "The Dating of Skelton's Later Poems". Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LIII (1938), 601-22.

Eliason, Norman E. The Language of Chaucer's Poetry. Copenhagen, 1972.

Elliott, Charles. "Two Notes on Henryson's 'Testament of Cresseid'". Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LIV (1955), 241-54.

Faral, E. Les Artes Poétiques du XIIe et du XIIIe Siècle. Paris, 1924.

Farnham, W. The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy. Berkeley, 1936.

Fest, O. "Über Surrey's Virgilübersetzung, nebst Neuaustrage des vierten Buches, nach Tottel's Originaldruck und der bisher ungedruckten Hargrave 205". Palaestra XXXIV. Berlin, 1905.

Fisher, John. John Gower: Moral Philosopher and Friend of Chaucer. London, 1965.

The Floure and the Leafe and The Assembly of Ladies. Ed. Derek Pearsall. London, 1962.

Fordun, John of. Scotichronicon Joannis de Fordun cum supplementis et continuatione Walteri Boweri. Ed. W. Goodall. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1759.

Fowler, William. The Works of William Fowler. Ed. W. Meikle, et al. 3 vols. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 6, 3rd Series, 7, 13. Edinburgh and London, 1914, 1936, 1940.

Fox, Denton. "Dunbar's 'The Golden Targe'". English Literary History, XXVI (1959), 311-34.

_____. "Henryson and Caxton". Journal of English and Germanic Philology, LXVII (1968), 586-93.

_____. "Henryson's 'Fables'". English Literary History, XXIX (1962), 337-56.

_____. "The Scottish Chaucerians", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, ed. D. S. Brewer, 164-200.

_____. "Chaucer's Influence on Fifteenth Century Poetry", in Companion to Chaucer Studies, ed. B. Rowland, 385-402.

Fraser, R.A., ed. See The Court of Venus.

Freeburg, V. Disguise Plots in Elizabethan Drama. New York, 1915.

Furnivall, F. J., ed. Political, Religious, and Love Poems. Early English Text Society, Original Series 15. London, 1866.

_____, ed. The Minor Poems of the Vernon MS. Early English Text Society, Original Series 117. London, 1901.

_____, and A. W. Pollard, eds. The Macro Plays. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 91. London, 1904.

_____, and W. G. Stone, eds. The Tale of Beryn. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 105. London, 1909.

Gairdner, J., ed. The Paston Letters: A.D. 1422-1509. 6 vols. London, 1904.

_____, ed. Letters and Papers Illustrative of the Reigns of Richard III and Henry VII. 2 vols. London, 1861.

Geddie, W. A Bibliography of Middle Scots Poets. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 61. Edinburgh and London, 1912.

Girvan, R., ed. Ratis Raving and other Early Scots Poems on Morals. Scottish Text Society, 3rd Series, 11. Edinburgh and London, 1939.

Gordon, E. V., ed. Pearl. Oxford, 1953.

Gordon, I. A. John Skelton, Poet Laureate. Melbourne and London, 1943.

_____. "A Skelton Query". Times Literary Supplement, November 15, 1934.

Gordon, Ida L. The Double Sorrow of Troilus. Oxford, 1970.

Gordon, R. K., ed. and tr. The Story of Troilus. London, 1934.

Gower, John. The English Works of John Gower. Ed. G. C. Macaulay. 2 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 81, 82. London, 1900-01.

Gradon, Pamela. Form and Style in Early English Literature. London, 1971.

Grant, J. A History of the Burgh and Parish Schools of Scotland. London and Glasgow, 1876.

Gray, James. "A Note on Henryson". Times Literary Supplement, March 13, 1953.

Grey, M. M., ed. Lancelot of the Laik. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 2. Edinburgh and London, 1912.

_____. "Surrey's Vocabulary". Times Literary Supplement, October 3, 1936.

Guy, Earl F. Some Comic and Burlesque Poems in Two Sixteenth Century Manuscript Anthologies. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1952.

Hale, D. G. "Aesop in Renaissance England". The Library, 5th Series, XXVII (1972), 116-25.

Hammond, E. P. Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual. New York, 1908; repr. 1933.

_____, ed. English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey. Durham, N. C., 1927.

Harbage, A. Annals of English Drama, 975-1700. Rev. S. Schoenbaum. London, 1974.

Harris, W. O. Skelton's 'Magnyfycence' and the Cardinal Virtue Tradition. Chapel Hill, 1965.

Harth, Sydney J. Convention and Creation in the Poetry of Robert Henryson: A Study of 'The Testament of Cresseid' and 'Orpheus and Eurydice'. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Chicago, 1960.

_____. "Henryson Reinterpreted". Essays in Criticism, XI (1961), 471-80.

Harward, V. "'Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis' Again". Studies in Scottish Literature, VII, iii (1970), 139-46.

Hary. Hary's Wallace. Ed. Matthew P. McDiarmid. 2 vols. Scottish Text Society, 4th Series, 3-4. Edinburgh and London, 1968-9.

Hawes, Stephen. The Pastime of Pleasure. Ed. W. E. Mead. Early English Text Society, Original Series 173. London, 1928.

_____. The Minor Poems. Ed. F. W. Gluck and A. B. Morgan. Early English Text Society, Original Series 271. London, 1974.

Haye, Gilbert of the. Gilbert of the Haye's Prose Manuscript (1456). Ed. J. H. Stevenson. 2 vols. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 44, 62. Edinburgh and London, 1901, 1914.

Hazlitt, W. C., ed. Select Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England. Vol. III. London, 1864.

Heisermann, A. R. Skelton and Satire. Chicago, 1961.

Henderson, T. F. Scottish Vernacular Literature: A History. 3rd edn., Edinburgh, 1910.

Henryson, Robert. The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson. Ed. H. Harvey Wood. 2nd edn., Edinburgh and London, 1958.

_____. The Poems of Robert Henryson. Ed. G. Gregory Smith. 3 vols. in 2. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 58, 64. Edinburgh and London, 1906-7, 1909-10.

_____. The Fabulous tales of Esope the Phrygian, Compiled moste eloquently in Scottische Metre by Master Robert Henrison, & now lately Englished. London, 1577.

_____. Testament of Cresseid. Ed. Denton Fox. London and Edinburgh, 1968.

_____. Robert Henryson: Poems. Ed. Charles Elliott. Oxford, 1963.

Hervieux, Léopold, ed. Les Fabulistes Latins depuis le Siècle d'Auguste jusqu'à la Fin du Moyen Age. 5 vols. Paris, 1893-8.

Hope, A. D. A Midsummer Eve's Dream: Variations on a Theme by William Dunbar. Canberra, 1970.

Horatius Flaccus. The Works of Horace. Ed. J. Lonsdale and S. Lee. London, 1900.

Howard, Henry, Earl of Surrey. Poems. Ed. Emrys Jones. Oxford, 1964.

_____. The Works of Henry Howard. Ed. G. F. Nott. 2 vols. London, 1815.

_____. Surrey's 'Fourth Boke of Virgill'. Ed. H. Hartmann. London and New York, 1933.

_____. The 'Aeneid' of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Ed. F. H. Ridley. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963.

Hume Brown, P., ed. Scotland before 1700; From Contemporary Documents. Edinburgh, 1893.

Hyde, Isabel. "Poetic Imagery: A Point of Comparison between Henryson and Dunbar". Studies in Scottish Literature, II (1965), 189-97.

_____. "Primary Sources and Associations of Dunbar's Aureate Imagery". Modern Language Review, LI (1956), 481-92.

Irving, David. History of Scottish Poetry. Edinburgh, 1861.

Jack, R. D. S. The Italian Influence on Scottish Literature. Edinburgh, 1970.

_____. "Dunbar and Lydgate". Studies in Scottish Literature, VIII, iv (1971), 215-27.

Jacob, E. F. The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485. Oxford, 1961.

James I of Scotland. The Kingis Quair of James Stewart. Ed. Matthew P. McDiarmid. London, 1973.

_____. James I of Scotland: The Kingis Quair. Ed. J. Norton-Smith. Oxford, 1971.

_____. The Kingis Quair. Ed. W. Mackay Mackenzie. London, 1939.

_____. The Kingis Quair and the Quare of Jelusy. Ed. A. Lawson. London, 1910.

_____. The Kingis Quair, together with A Ballad of Good Counsel. Ed. W. W. Skeat. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 1. Edinburgh and London, 1911.

James I of Scotland. Le Livre du Roi. Ed. and trans. J. R. Simon. Paris, 1967.

James VI and I. The Poems of James VI of Scotland. Ed. James Craigie. 2 vols. Scottish Text Society, 3rd Series, 22, 26. Edinburgh and London, 1955, 1958.

Jamieson, I. W. A. The Poetry of Robert Henryson: A Study in the Uses of Source Material. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1965.

_____. "A Further Source for Henryson's 'Fabillis'". Notes and Queries, XIV (1967), 403-5.

_____. "The Minor Poems of Robert Henryson". Studies in Scottish Literature, IX, ii (1971), 125-47.

_____. "To preue thare preching be a poesye: some thoughts on Henryson's poetics". Parergon, VIII (1974), 24-36.

Jentoft, C. W. "Henryson as Authentic 'Chaucerian': Narrator, Character, and Courtly Love in 'The Testament of Cresseid'". Studies in Scottish Literature, X, ii (1972), 94-102.

Kane, George. 'Piers Plowman': The Evidence for Authorship. London, 1965.

_____. The Autobiographical Fallacy in Chaucer and Langland Studies. London, 1965.

Kantrowitz, J. S. Dramatic Allegory: Lindsay's 'Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1975.

_____. "Encore: Lindsay's 'Thrie Estaitis', Date and New Evidence". Studies in Scottish Literature, X, i (1972), 18-32.

Kean, P. M. Chaucer and the Making of English Poetry. 2 vols. London and Boston, 1972.

Kelly, C. S. The Northern Arthur: a study of two alliterative Arthurian romances in their literary and historical context. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1975.

Kinghorn, A. M. The Chorus of History: literary-historical relations in Renaissance Britain, 1485-1588. London, 1971.

_____. "The Minor Poems of Robert Henryson". Studies in Scottish Literature, III, i (1965), 30-40.

_____, ed. The Middle Scots Poets. London, 1970.

Kinneavy, G. B. "The Poet in 'The Palice of Honour'". Chaucer Review, III (1968), 280-303.

Kinsley, James. "The Mediaeval Makars", in Scottish Poetry: A Critical Survey. Ed. J. Kinsley. London, 1955.

_____. "A Note on Henryson". Times Literary Supplement, November 14, 1952.

_____. "The Tretis of the Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo". Medium Aevum, XXIII (1954), 31-5.

Knight, S. T. "Ryming craftily": Meaning in Chaucer's Poetry. Sydney, 1973.

Knight, W. F. J. Roman Vergil. London, 1944.

Kratzmann, G. C. "The Nightingale and the Cuckoo: Literary Reminiscence in 'The Kingis Quair'". Scottish Literary Journal, II, i (1975), 70-71. See Appendix I.

Laing, David, ed. Select Remains of the Ancient Popular and Romance Poetry of Scotland. Edinburgh and London, 1885.

Lancelot of the Laik. See Grey, M. M., ed.

Lange, P. "Chaucers Einfluss auf die Originaldichtungen des Schotten Douglas". Anglia, VI (1883), 46-95.

Langland, William. Langland's Vision of Piers the Plowman: Text C. Ed. W. W. Skeat. Early English Text Society, Original Series 54. London, 1873.

Lawlor, John. "Piers Plowman": An Essay in Criticism. London, 1962.

_____. Chaucer. London, 1968.

_____. "The Earlier Poems", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, ed. D. S. Brewer, 36-94.

Lester, J. A. "Some Franco-Scottish Influences on the Early English Drama". Haverford Essays: Studies in Modern Literature. Haverford, Pa., 1909.

Lewis, C. S. The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition. Oxford, 1936.

_____. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, excluding Drama. Oxford, 1954.

_____. "The Fifteenth Century Heroic Line". Essays and Studies, XXIV (1938), 28-41.

Leyerle, J. "The Two Voices of William Dunbar". University of Toronto Quarterly, XXXI (1962), 316-38.

Lindesay of Pitscottie, Robert. The Historie and Chronicles of Scotland. Ed. Aeneas J. G. Mackay. 2 vols. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 42-3. Edinburgh and London, 1899.

Lindsay, David. The Works of Sir David Lindsay of the Mount. Ed. Douglas Hamer. 4 vols. Scottish Text Society, 3rd Series, 1,2,6,8. Edinburgh and London, 1931-6.

_____. Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis. Ed. J. Kinsley. London, 1954.

Linthicum, M. C. Costume in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries. Oxford, 1936.

Lloyd, L. J. John Skelton: A Sketch of his Life and Writings. Oxford, 1938.

Longchamps, Nigel de. Nigel de Longchamps Speculum Stultorum. Ed. J. H. Mozley and R. R. Raymo. Berkeley, 1960.

Lyall, R. J. "Moral Allegory in Dunbar's 'Goldyn Targe'". Studies in Scottish Literature, XI, i (1973), 47-65.

_____. "Tradition and Innovation in Alexander Barclay's 'Towre of Vertue and Honoure'". Review of English Studies, New Series XXIII (1972), 1-18.

Lydgate, John. The Minor Poems of John Lydgate. Ed. H. N. MacCracken. 2 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 107, Original Series 192. London, 1911, 1934.

_____. The Temple of Glas. Ed. J. Schick. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 60. London, 1891.

_____. Reson and Sensuallite. Ed. E. Sieper. 2 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 84, 89. London, 1901-3.

_____. The Fall of Princes. Ed. H. Bergen. 4 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 121-4. London, 1918-19.

_____. The Troy Book. Ed. H. Bergen. 4 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 97, 103, 106, 126. London, 1906-35.

_____. The Siege of Thebes. Ed. A. Erdmann and E. Ekwall. 2 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 108, 125. London, 1911-20.

_____. The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man. Ed. F. J. Furnivall and K. B. Locock. 3 vols. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 77, 83, 92. London, 1899-1904.

_____. The Dance of Death. Ed. F. Warren and B. White. Early English Text Society, Original Series 181. London, 1931.

_____. See The Assembly of Gods.

Mackay, M. A. The Alliterative Tradition in Middle Scots Verse. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Edinburgh, 1975.

_____. "The Scots of the Makars", in Lowland Scots: papers presented to an Edinburgh conference. Edinburgh, 1973.

Mackie, R. L. King James IV of Scotland: A Brief Survey of his Life and Times. Edinburgh, 1958.

Magnus, L. A., ed. See Respublica.

The Maitland Folio Manuscript. Ed. W. A. Craigie. 2 vols. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 7, 20. Edinburgh and London, 1927.

The Maitland Quarto Manuscript. Ed. W. A. Craigie. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 9. Edinburgh and London, 1920.

Major, John. A History of Greater Britain. Ed. and trans. A. Constable. Scottish History Society Publications. Edinburgh, 1892.

The Makculloch and the Gray Manuscripts, Pieces from. Ed. G. Stevenson. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 65. Edinburgh and London, 1918.

Manly, J., ed. Specimens of the Pre-Shakspearean Drama. 2 vols. Boston, 1897.

Markland, M. F. "The Structure of 'The Kingis Quair'". Research Studies of the State College of Washington, XXV (1957), 273-86.

Mason, H. A. Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period. London, 1959.

Mehl, Dieter. "The Audience of Chaucer's 'Troilus and Criseyde'", in Chaucer and Middle English Studies, ed. B. Rowland, 173-89.

Metham, John. John Metham's Works. Ed. H. Craig. Early English Text Society, Original Series 132. London, 1906.

Mill, A. J. Medieval Plays in Scotland. Edinburgh and London, 1927.

_____. "The Influence of Continental Drama on Lyndsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'". Modern Language Review, XXV (1930), 425-42.

_____. "The Original Version of Lindsay's 'Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis'". Studies in Scottish Literature, VI, ii (1968), 67-75.

Montgomerie, Alexander. The Poems of Alexander Montgomerie. Ed. J. Cranstoun. 3 vols. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 9, 10, 11. Edinburgh and London, 1887. Supplementary Volume. Ed. G. Stevenson. 1st Series, 59. 1910.

Moore, A. K. The Secular Lyric in Middle English. Lexington, 1951.

Moran, Tatyana. "'The Testament of Cresseid' and the 'Book of Troylus'". Litera, VI (1959), 18-24.

Morgan, Edwin. "Dunbar and the Language of Poetry". Essays in Criticism, II (1952), 138-58.

Muir, Edwin. Essays on Literature and Society. London, 1949.

Murison, William. Sir David Lindsay, Poet, and Satirist of the Old Church in Scotland. Cambridge, 1938.

Murray, J. A. H., ed. See The Complaynt of Scotlande.

Muscatine, Charles. Chaucer and the French Tradition: A Study in Style and Meaning. Berkeley, 1957.

_____. "'The Canterbury Tales': style of the man and style of the work", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, ed. D. S. Brewer, 88-113.

McDemott, J. J. "Henryson's 'Testament of Cresseid' and Heywood's 'A Woman Killed with Kindness'". Renaissance Quarterly, XX (1967), 16-21.

McDiarmid, M. P. Review of Baxter, William Dunbar. Scottish Historical Review, XXXII (1954), 46-52.

MacDonald, C. M. "The Struggle of George Dundas for the Preceptory of Torphichen". Scottish Historical Review, XIV (1916), 19-48.

MacDonald, D. "Henryson and Chaucer: Cock and Fox". Texas Studies in Literature and Language, VIII (1966), 451-61.

_____. "Chaucer's Influence on Henryson's Fables: the use of proverbs and sententiae". Medium Aevum, XXXIX (1970), 21-7.

MacQueen, John. Robert Henryson: A Study of the Major Narrative Poems. Oxford, 1967.

_____. Allegory. London, 1970.

_____. "Some Aspects of the Early Renaissance in Scotland". Forum for Modern Language Studies, III (1967), 201-22.

MacQueen, John. "Alexander Scott and Scottish Court Poetry". (Warton Lecture) Proceedings of the British Academy, LIV (1968), 93-113: Appendix, 114-16.

_____. "The case for early Scottish literature", in Edinburgh Studies in English and Scots, ed. A. J. Aitken, 234-47.

_____. "Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis". Studies in Scottish Literature, III, iii (1966), 129-43.

_____. "Tradition and the Interpretation of the 'Kingis Quair'". Review of English Studies, New Series XII (1961), 117-31.

_____, ed. Ballattis of Luve. Edinburgh, 1970.

_____, and Winifred MacQueen, eds. A Choice of Scottish Verse, 1470-1570. London, 1972.

McRoberts, David, ed. Essays on the Scottish Reformation, 1513-1625. Glasgow, 1962.

Nelson, William. John Skelton, Laureate. New York, 1939.

Nevill, William. The Castell of Pleasure. Ed. R. D. Cornelius. Early English Text Society, Original Series 179. London, 1930.

Nichols, Pierrepont H. "William Dunbar as a Scottish Lydgatian". Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XLVI (1931), 214-24.

Nicolas, N. H., ed. Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York. London, 1830.

Noll, Dolores L. "'The Testament of Cresseid': Are Christian Interpretations Valid?" Studies in Scottish Literature, IX, i (1971), 16-25.

Patch, Howard Rollin. The Goddess Fortuna in Mediaeval Literature. New York, 1927.

Payne, R. O. The Key of Remembrance: A Study of Chaucer's Poetics. New Haven and London, 1963.

Pearl. See Gordon, E. V., ed.

Pearsall, Derek A. John Lydgate. London, 1970.

_____. "The English Chaucerians", in Chaucer and Chaucerians, ed. D. S. Brewer, 201-39.

_____, ed. See The Floure and the Leafe and The Assembly of Ladies.

-10-

Peter, John. Complaint and Satire in Early English Literature. Oxford, 1956.

Peterson, Kate O. On the Sources of 'The Nonnes Preestes Tale'. Radcliffe College Monographs, X. Boston, 1898.

Pinkerton, John, ed. Ancient Scottish Poems; Reprinted from Scarce Editions. 2 vols. London, 1786.

Plessow, M. "Geschichte der Fabeldichtung in England bis zu John Gay". Palaestra XLI. Berlin, 1906.

Pollard, A. W. Fifteenth Century Verse and Prose. London, 1903.

_____, ed. See The Castell of Labour.

Pollet, M. John Skelton: Poet of Tudor England. Tr. J. Warrington. London, 1971.

Pound, Ezra. ABC of Reading. London, 1951.

Preston, John. "'Fortunys Exiltree': A Study of 'The Kingis Quair'". Review of English Studies, New Series VII (1956), 339-47.

Puttenham, George. The Arte of English Poesie. Ed. G. Willcock and A. Walker. Cambridge, 1936.

The Quare of Jelusy. See Brown, J. T. T., ed.

Rait, R. S. 'The Kingis Quair' and the New Criticism. Aberdeen, 1898.

Ratis Raving. See Girvan, R., ed.

Ramson, W. S. "In Praise of Chaucer". Proceedings and Papers of the XII Conference of the Australasian Language and Literature Association. Sydney, 1970.

Register. The Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland. I, 1488-1529. Ed. M. Livingstone. Edinburgh, 1908.

_____. The Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland. II, 1529-42. Ed. D. H. Fleming. Edinburgh, 1921.

Renoir, A. The Poetry of John Lydgate. London, 1967.

Renwick, W. L., and H. Orton. The Beginnings of English Literature to Skelton, 1509. 3rd edn. London, 1966.

Respublica: A Play on Social England. Ed. L. A. Magnus. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 94. London, 1905.

Ridley, F. H. "Surrey's Debt to Gawin Douglas". Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LXXVI (1961), 25-33.

Ritchie, R. L. Graeme, ed. See The Buik of Alexander.

Ritchie, W. Tod, ed. See The Bannatyne Manuscript.

Robb, T. D., ed. See The Thre Prestis of Peblis.

Robbins, R. H., ed. Secular Lyrics of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Oxford, 1952.

Rolland, John. The Court of Venus. Ed. W. Gregor. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 3. Edinburgh and London, 1884.

_____. The Seuin Seages. Ed. G. F. Black. Scottish Text Society, 3rd Series, 3. Edinburgh and London, 1932.

Rollins, Hyder E. "The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare". Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXXII (1917), 383-429.

Root, R. K. The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Troilus. Chaucer Society Publications, 1st Series, 98. London, 1914.

Rowland, Beryl, ed. Chaucer and Middle English Studies in Honour of Rossell Hope Robbins. London, 1974.

_____, ed. Companion to Chaucer Studies. Toronto, 1968.

Rudd, Niall. The Satires of Horace. Cambridge, 1966.

Salter, F. M. "New Light on Skelton". Times Literary Supplement, January 17, 1935.

Scarisbrick, J. J. Henry VIII. Harmondsworth, 1968.

Scheps, W. "Chaucerian Synthesis: The Art of 'The Kingis Quair'". Studies in Scottish Literature, VIII, iii (1971), 143-65.

Schipper, W. William Dunbar: sein Leben und seine Gedichte. Berlin, 1884.

Schirmer, W. F. John Lydgate: A Study in the Culture of the Fifteenth Century. Tr. A. Keep. London, 1971.

Schumacher, A. Des Bischofs Gavin Douglas Übersetzung der Aeneis Vergils. Strassburg, 1910.

Scott, Alexander. The Poems of Alexander Scott. Ed. J. Cranstoun. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 36. Edinburgh and London, 1896.

Scott, Tom. Dunbar: A Critical Exposition of the Poems. Edinburgh and London, 1966.

Seaton, Ethel. "That Scotch Copy of Chaucer". Journal of English and Germanic Philology, XLVII (1948), 352-6.

Shakespeare, William. Troilus and Cressida. Ed. D. Seltzer. New York and Scarborough, 1963.

Shepherd, G. T. "The Narrator in 'Troilus and Criseyde'", in Critics on Chaucer, ed. S. Sullivan. London, 1970.

Sinclair, James A. "The Lordship of Sinclair". Scottish Notes and Queries, XI, vii (1898), 96-8.

Skeat, W. W., ed. Chaucerian and Other Pieces. The Complete Works of Chaucer, Supplementary Volume. Oxford, 1897.

Skelton, John. The Poetical Works of John Skelton. Ed. A. Dyce. 2 vols. London, 1843.

_____. The Complete Poems of John Skelton, Laureate. Ed. P. Henderson. London, 1948.

_____. Magnyfycence. Ed. R. L. Ramsay. Early English Text Society, Extra Series 98. London, 1910.

Smith, G. Gregory. Scottish Literature: Character and Influence. London, 1919.

_____. "The Scottish Chaucerians". In The Cambridge History of English Literature. Ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. Cambridge, 1908. Vol. II, 239-66.

_____, ed. Specimens of Middle Scots. Edinburgh and London, 1902.

Smith, Janet M. The French Background of Middle Scots Literature. Edinburgh, 1934.

Smith, W. G., and J. E. Heseltine, eds. The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs. Oxford, 1948.

Snyder, F. B. "'Sir Thomas Norray' and 'Sir Thopas'". Modern Language Notes, XXV (1910), 78-80.

Southall, R. The Courtly Maker. London, 1964.

Spearing, A. C. Criticism and Medieval Poetry. Rev. edn. London, 1972.

Speirs, John. The Scots Literary Tradition: An Essay in Criticism. 2nd edn. London, 1962.

_____. "William Dunbar". Scrutiny VII (1938), 56-8.

Spenser, Edmund. Spenser: Poetical Works. Ed. J. C. Smith and E. de Selincourt. London, 1912.

Spivack, Bernard. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil: The History of a Metaphor in Relation to His Major Villains. New York, 1958.

Spurgeon, Caroline F., comp. Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900. 3 vols. Chaucer Society Publications, 48-56. London, 1914-25.

Starkey, Penelope S. "Gavin Douglas's 'Eneados': Dilemmas in the Nature Prologues". Studies in Scottish Literature, XI, i (1973), 82-98.

Stearns, M. W. Robert Henryson. New York, 1949.

_____. "The Planet Portraits of Robert Henryson". Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LIX (1944), 911-27.

_____. "A Note on Henryson and Lydgate". Modern Language Notes, LX (1945), 101-3.

_____. "Chaucer Mentions a Book". Modern Language Notes, LVII (1942), 28-31.

Stevens, John. Music and Poetry in the Early Tudor Court. London, 1961.

Stevenson, G., ed. See The Makculloch and Gray Manuscripts.

Stevick, R. D., ed. One Hundred Middle English Lyrics. New York, 1964.

Taylor, H. O. The Medieval Mind. 2 vols. 4th edn. Cambridge, Mass., 1962.

Taylor, R. A. Dunbar the Poet and his Period. London, 1931.

Thompson, John. Guide to Rosslyn Chapel and Castle. Edinburgh, 1922.

Thompson, John. The Founding of English Metre. London, 1961.

Thomson, Patricia. Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background. Stanford, 1964.

The Thre Prestis of Peblis. Ed. T. D. Robb. Scottish Text Society, 2nd Series, 8. Edinburgh and London, 1920.

Tillyard, E. M. W. Five Poems, 1470-1870. London, 1948.

Treasurer. Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, 1473-1574. 12 vols. Eds. T. Dickson, J. B. Paul, and C. T. McInnes. Edinburgh, 1877-1970.

Triggs, O. L., ed. See The Assembly of Gods.

Varty, Kenneth. Reynard the Fox: A Study of the Fox in Medieval English Art. Leicester, 1967.

Vergilius Maro. The Aeneid. Ed. J. W. Mackail. Oxford, 1930.

Vinsauf, Geoffroi de. "Poetria Nova". In Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts, ed. and trans. J. J. Murphy and J. B. Kopp. Berkeley and London, 1971.

Vogel, B. "Secular Politics and the Date of 'Lancelot of the Laik'". Studies in Philology, XL (1943), 1-13.

Ward, A. W. A History of English Literature to the Death of Queen Anne. 2 vols. London, 1875.

Warton, Thomas. The History of English Poetry. 4 vols. Ed. W. C. Hazlitt. 4th edn., London, 1871.

Whiting, B. J. "A Probable Allusion to Henryson's 'Testament of Cresseid'". Modern Language Review, XL (1945), 46-7.

_____, ed. Proverbs, Sentences, and Proverbial Phrases, From English Writings mainly before 1500. Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1968.

Wierum, Ann. "'Actors' and 'Play Acting' in the Morality Tradition". Renaissance Drama, III (1970), 189-214.

Wilson, F. P. The English Drama, 1485-1585. Oxford, 1969.

Winser, L. "Skelton's 'Magnyfycence'". Renaissance Quarterly, XXIII (1970), 14-25.

Wittig, Kurt. The Scottish Tradition in Literature. Edinburgh and London, 1958.

Wood, H. Harvey. "Robert Henryson". Edinburgh Essays on Scots Literature. Edinburgh, 1933.

Woolf, Rosemary M. The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages. Oxford, 1968.

Wyatt, Thomas. Collected Poems. Ed. Kenneth Muir. London, 1949.

Wyntoun, Andrew of. The Original Chronicle of Andrew of Wyntoun. Ed. F. J. Amours. Scottish Text Society, 1st Series, 50, 53, 54, 56, 57, 63. Edinburgh and London, 1903-8, 1914.

Young, Karl. The Drama of the Medieval Church. 2 vols. Oxford, 1933.